UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

ADOPTION OF A SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAM BY SHERWOOD PARK CATHOLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL DISTRICT: A PROMISING BEGINNING

BY

DIANNE OBERG

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION STUDIES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1992

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-77424-X

Canada

UNVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Dianne Oberg

TITLE OF THESIS: Adoption of a School Library Program by Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District: A Promising Beginning

DEGREE: Doctor of Philosophy

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1992

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication rights in association with this thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial part thereof may be printed or reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Dianne Oberg

603-10101 Saskatchewan Drive
Edmonton, Alberta T6E 4R6

September 28, 1992

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled Adoption of a School Library Program by Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District: A Promising Beginning submitted by Dianne Oberg in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Library and Information Studies.

Dr. S. Bertram

Dr. D. A. MacKay

Dr. A. Altmann

Dr. L. LaRocque

Dr. D. Cullen

Dr. E. B. Newton

April 30, 1992

This thesis is dedicated to Sheila Bertram,

for her unwavering enthusiasm, faith, and inspiration.

ABSTRACT

A case study approach was used to examine the processes that led to the adoption of an educational innovation, a cooperative integrated school library program model, by Sherwood Park Catholic Separate District No. 105, Sherwood Park, Alberta. The school library program model adopted by The District for its high school was that recommended by Alberta Education in the document, Focus on Learning. The adoption process was facilitated by the innovation capacity of The District, by the active leadership of the Superintendent and the Board of Trustees, by the existence of a provincial policy and program model, and by access to new funding. The evaluation of libraries in The District played a key role in changing the understanding of the nature of the school library, from that of a facility and a collection, isolated from the curriculum and operating under the responsibility of support personnel, to that of an instructional program, integral to the curriculum and directed by teachers. Four propositions about the nature of the adoption process emerged from the case study, related to the time involved, a problem-solving orientation, understanding the innovation, and school board leadership. Implications for practitioners included the importance of developing an understanding of the innovation, the contribution of program evaluation to the adoption process, the importance of district-level leaders working together, and the role of funding in the adoption process. Further research is suggested in relation to the role of school boards in improving education, the relationship between the development of shared meanings and the effectiveness of program evaluation, and the identification of factors critical to the adoption of complex innovations such as the cooperative integrated school library program. Questions are raised about the use of case study research in terms of the possibility of alternative interpretations, the effects of time and success on interpretations, and the transferability of findings.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
1	THE NATURE OF THE STUDY	1
	Introduction	1
	Planned Change in Education	1
	Background of the Study	3
	Statement of the Problem	5
	Definitions of Terms	6
	Delimitations of the Study	7
	Limitations of the Study	8
	Significance of the Study	8
	Organization of the Report	9
2	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
	Literature Reviews in Qualitative Research	10
	Literature Review Relating to Emerging Themes	11
	District Capacity for Innovation	11
	Selection of the Innovation	14
	Roles in the Adoption Process	15
	Understanding of the Innovation	17
	Chapter Summary	21
3	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	22
	Theoretical Orientation	22
	Qualitative Research Methodologies	22
	The Case Study Approach	23
	Selection of the Research Site	24
	Data Collection.	26
	Types of Data	26
	Interviewing Method	27
	Role of Informants	28
	Role of the Researcher	29
	Data Analysis	29
	Ethical Considerations	30
	Research Trustworthiness	31
	Chapter Summary	32

4 CASE DESCRIPTION 34

The School District 34
Early Development of The District's Libraries 36
School Library Program Evaluation 38
Chapter Summary 44

5 FINDINGS: DISTRICT CAPACITY FOR INNOVATION 46

Innovation History of The District 46
Innovation Successes 47
Two Innovation Failures 48
Effect of Innovation History on Innovation Capacity 49
Orientation of The District 51
Culture of The District 53
District Capacity for Innovation 33
Access to New Funding 57
Chapter Summary 58

6 FINDINGS: SELECTION OF LIBRARIES AS A FOCUS FOR CHANGE 59

Perceived Need 60
Development of the Innovation 61
Provincial Policy Supporting the Innovation 61
Awareness of the Innovation 62
Advocacy for the Innovation 64
Selection of Other Innovations for Adoption 66
Chapter Summary 68

7 FINDINGS: KEY ROLES IN THE ADOPTION PROCESS ... 69

Shared Responsibilities 69
Role of Students and Parents 69
Role of Principals and Teachers 70
Role of Trustees 72
Role of the Superintendent 73
Role of the Director, Curriculum and Instruction 76
Role of the External Evaluators 78
Interrelationships Among the Key Roles 80
Chapter Summary 81

8. FINDINGS: UNDERSTANDING OF THE INNOVATION ... 83

Development of New Understandings 83
The Role of the School Library 84
The Purpose of the School Library 85
The Library as Collection and Facility 85
The Library as Instructional Program 86
Place of the Library Program in Schooling 87
Isolated from Teaching and Learning 87
Integral to Teaching and Learning 88
Responsibility for the Library Program 89
Support Personnel 89
Teaching Personnel 90
Sources of the New Understandings 91
Alberta Education Policy and Program Model 91
The Evaluation Process 92
Chapter Summary 94

9 PROPOSITIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND QUESTIONS 95

Summary of the Case Study 95
Propositions 96
1. Adoption is a process over time 96
2. Adoption is a process of changing meaning 97
3. Adoption is problem-solving process 99
4. Adoption is influenced by school board leadership 100
Implications 101
Implications for Practice 101
1. The importance of the adoption stage in planned change 101
2. The role of program evaluation in program adoption ... 102
3. The effectiveness of the program evaluation process .. 103
4. District level leaders working together 103
5. The role of funding in the adoption process 104
6. The role of school boards in adoption 105
Implications for Research 105
1. Critical factors in adoption 105
2. Critical factors in the adoption of the cooperative integrated school library program 106
3. Program evaluation and program meaning 106
4. The role of school boards in improving education 106
Questions for Reflection 107
1. The possibility of other interpretations 107
2. The effect of time on interpretations 107
3. The effect of success on interpretations 108
4. The transferability of findings 109
A Bright Beginning 110

10 EPILOGUE 112

BIBLIOGRAPHY 119

APPENDICES 124

A Interview Schedule 124
B Informed Consent Form 125
C Letter of Permission 126
D Letter to Informants 127
E Case Data Base 128
F Case Chronology 136

Chapter 1

THE NATURE OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Much research has been done in relation to the process of planned change in education, particularly the introduction of innovative programs or practices. Very little research has been done, however, into the introduction of the cooperative integrated school library program model that has been advocated by school library leaders in Canada since the 1970s. The cooperative integrated school library program model is an innovation that involves classroom teachers and teacher-librarians working together to teach students the information skills essential for independent learning. The cooperative integrated school library program model is now recommended by provincial departments of education in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Ontario.

Planned Change in Education

Planned change in education involves the purposeful introduction and incorporation of a new practice such as the cooperative integrated school library program. Many models of the process of planned change reflect Lewin's three stages of unfreezing, moving to a new level, and refreezing (1951). In education, these three stages are usually termed: (a) adoption, mobilization, or initiation; (b) implementation; and (c) institutionalization or continuance.

Adoption is the process that leads up to and includes the decision to begin to put a new practice in place; implementation, the steps taken to put the new practice in place; and institutionalization, the incorporation of the new

practice into established practice. What happens at each stage in the process affects subsequent stages. Success at one stage does not mean that success will be experienced at later stages. The adoption of an innovation does not mean that the innovation will continue to be used after the adoption and implementation efforts have been completed. For more than a decade, researchers have been focussing on the concept of implementation because of the recognition (Patterson & Czaijkowski, 1979) that continuing an innovation or institutionalizing it is a more complex problem than earlier models might suggest.

The process of planned change in education is complex. Leavitt (1972) pointed out that change in one aspect of a task causes changes in other aspects, which in turn changes the task. There is a complicated interrelationship among the people, technology, and structure involved in a task; changing one almost inevitably changes the others and not always in ways that can be predicted or controlled. Berman (1978) noted that the complexity increases when multiple agencies are involved in implementing the innovation, and that the innovation itself will be changed as it passes through each agency. Schools, school districts, and provincial departments of education are multifaceted organizations, joined together in complicated relationships and affected strongly by the economic and social milieu in which they operate. This complexity is illustrated in Fullan's discussion (1982a) of 29 factors associated with planned change in education.

In relation to the adoption stage, Fullan (1991) identified eight sources of influence on initiation decisions, ranging from the existence and quality of innovations to the problem-solving or bureaucratic orientations of school districts. There is a growing understanding that many technical factors, political factors and cultural factors are important in the process of planned

change, but the development of theoretical frameworks that clearly explain the interactions of those factors is just beginning.

Background of the Study

In 1984, the Minister of Education approved a policy for Alberta school libraries:

> Students in Alberta schools should have access to an effective school library program integrated with instructional programs to provide improved opportunities for student achievement of the Goals of Basic Education for Alberta. (Alberta Education, 1984)

This policy was issued in response to "wide concern regarding the present state of school libraries and a strong perception that the quality of school library programs is deteriorating" (Alberta Education, 1985, p. 58). At present, there are school districts in the province which have not yet begun to implement the policy and program model outlined in the 1985 Alberta Education document, Focus on Learning.

This is not surprising. Alberta Education's role in the development of effective school library programs has been one of encouragement, guidance, and assistance; the responsibility for actually putting programs into practice has been that of the local school district. Alberta Education has supported the introduction of cooperative integrated school library programs by school districts through dissemination of information, primarily through policy documents and inservice activities.

Information dissemination has raised awareness of the need for change but it has not brought about much change. Many school districts in Alberta do not appear to have the expertise and resources to make the changes required to develop the cooperative integrated school library program. As pointed out by Brown (1988) and Oberg (1990), there has been little recognition, within

schools and school districts as well as within the literature of school librarianship, of the complexity of the changes involved in incorporating this approach. The focus in the field of school librarianship, as in the policies and practices of provincial ministries of education, has been on information dissemination, primarily the description and advocacy of particular program models.

The cooperative integrated school library program model is an innovation that involves changes in materials, in practices, and in beliefs for teachers. To implement the program, teachers use a wide variety of resources in many formats. They plan and teach with others. Their focus is on individualizing instruction, on maximizing students' freedom and independence, and on facilitiating learning. The program also involves changes in the way that the school is organized. Team planning and team teaching, along with variations in relation to resources, locations, and group sizes, require changes in the scheduling, budgeting, and planning practices of the school.

In only a few districts in Alberta have schools incorporated the cooperative integrated school library program into their practice; that is, few schools and few districts have made this type of school library program a regular part of their teaching and learning programs. The cooperative integrated school library program is an innovation that has not yet been very widely adopted, implemented, or institutionalized. Although this seems to be a consistent pattern across Canada, there have been few systematic, in-depth investigations of the extent to which the cooperative integrated school library program has been adopted, implemented, or institutionalized. Two recent studies have examined this question in relation to the program, one in the province of Ontario and one in a school district in Saskatchewan.

Dekker (1989) studied the impact of Partners in Action, the 1982 document that presented a cooperative integrated school library program model for Ontario schools. In her survey of 400 elementary schools in Ontario, Dekker found that the development of the program was very uneven. A minority of school districts had provided support, financial or otherwise, for introduction of the program. Over half of the districts had not formally adopted the program. Those districts had no policies or standards in place related to the school library program.

Meyer (1990) interviewed teachers in one district in Saskatchewan to determine the extent to which the cooperative integrated school library program, called resource-based learning in Saskatchewan, had been implemented. The district had adopted the program and had been encouraging implementation of the program for seven years. Meyer found that fewer than two-thirds of the teachers had incorporated the program into their teaching.

Most school districts in Alberta where the cooperative integrated school library program model has been incorporated into practice have been involved in the program for a considerable length of time, often for many years before this approach was officially sanctioned by Alberta Education. The decision by one school district, Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District, to improve its school libraries offered the opportunity to explore in depth the way in which a school district might go about adopting the type of school library program recommended in the Alberta Education policy and program model.

Statement of the Problem

The general question addressed in this study was as follows: Why and how did a particular school district adopt the cooperative integrated school library program model? The specific questions addressed include:

1. Why was the cooperative integrated school library program model selected for adoption by the school district?
2. Who or what was instrumental in the adoption of the cooperative integrated school library program model by the school district?
3. How was the cooperative integrated school library program model defined or understood by the participants in the adoption process?

Definitions of Terms

The following terms have been used throughout this study to discuss educational change. These terms have been used as they are defined here.

Planned change: the purposeful introduction and incorporation of a policy, practice, or program that involves new materials, new teaching approaches, and/or new beliefs or understandings (adapted from Fullan, 1991, p. 37).

Innovation: a policy, practice, or program that is new to a particular context, such as a school or school district, or to individuals within that particular context.

Adoption: the first stage of a process of planned change, often termed initiation, which involves those efforts leading up to and including the selection of a particular innovation and the decision to proceed with that innovation (adapted from Fullan, 1991, p. 47).

Implementation: the second stage of a process of planned change, which involves those efforts related to attempting to put an innovation into practice (adapted from Fullan, 1991, pp. 47-48).

Institutionalization: the third stage of a process of planned change, which involves the incorporation of an innovation into the established systems of an organization; also termed continuance (adapted from Fullan, 1991, p. 48).

Delimitations of the Study

Initially the study was conceived of as a case study of a high school adopting and implementing a cooperative integrated school library program where the program was new to both the district and the school. That case study would have necessarily spanned a long period of time. The process of planned change, through its phases, from initiation to institutionalization is generally a lengthy one. Fullan (1991, p. 49) states that "even moderately complex changes take from three to five years, while major restructuring efforts can take five to ten years." Louis (1986) suggests that major changes in secondary schools are likely to involve from ten to fifteen years of implementation efforts.

Therefore, in this thesis, only the adoption phase of the process has been addressed. This thesis is the starting point for a continuing research program focussing on the adoption, implementation, and institutionalization of the cooperative integrated school library program in a high school. The identification of a specific phenomenon or bounded system is essential to the case study approach (Merriam, 1988). The bounded system that will be addressed in this program of research is the school library program in the high school of the Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District, hereafter referred to as The District. Although The District decided to work to improve the libraries in all its schools, the high school library was of special concern and it was the one library provided with an on-site teacher-librarian.

This study has examined the adoption stage of one case of planned change, not the full cycle of planned change. The change process often involves three or more years of efforts related to adoption and implementation before the institutionalization of the innovation can be assessed. This study has examined how one small school district in Alberta decided to make major changes in the role of its school libraries. This study is directed at a deeper understanding of the change process.

Limitations of the Study

The researcher relied upon informants' powers of recall in relation to the period of time when the decisions were made about the adoption of the innovation. There is, however, documentation related to that time that was used to confirm informant information. Not all of the possible informants were interviewed for this study; useful information may not have come to light because some potential informants were not selected for interviews or because some declined the invitation to be interviewed.

Significance of the Study

There are many school districts in Alberta that have not yet adopted or implemented cooperative integrated school library programs consistent with Alberta Education policy. This study may assist those school districts in understanding how a cooperative integrated school library program model might be adopted.

Although there has been a great deal of research related to planned change in education, there have been few studies that have focussed specifically on the adoption stage of the change process in education. This

study may contribute in some small way to the understanding of the adoption stage as a process itself.

Organization of the Report

This chapter has identified the focus of the study and outlined the context of the study. It has also established that this study is part of a continuing program of research related to one school district's experience of the process of planned change through efforts to improve its school libraries.

Chapter 2 opens with a discussion of the approach used to review the research literature relevant to the case study, from the design stage through to the analysis stage. Following that, the literature related to four themes emerging from the analysis of the research data is reviewed.

Chapter 3 discusses the design of the study, the methods used for data collection and analysis, and issues related to research trustworthiness and ethics.

Chapter 4 is a description of the case.

Chapters 5-9 present the findings of the study and examine four themes emerging from the data of the case.

Chapter 10 presents propositions about the adoption process, implications for practitioners and for researchers, and questions for reflection.

Chapter 11 is an epilogue which outlines the initial implementation efforts of The District.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Literature Reviews in Qualitative Research

In order to develop a broad understanding of the background relevant to this case study, the literature related to planned educational change, to school culture, and to school library program implementation was examined. That reading of the literature was relevant to the general research question of how a school district might implement a school library program of the type envisioned in the Focus on Learning model.

This wide reading was undertaken, as recommended by Merriam (1988) and Yin (1989), to generate ideas, to sharpen questions and insights, and to help place the proposed research in the context of previous research. During the process of preparing the research proposal, more specific research questions evolved related to the first stage in planned change, adoption of the innovation. Because the adoption of the cooperative integrated school library program was primarily a district level decision, the literature related to the role of the district in adoption was examined.

After the collection and analysis of the initial data, the literature pertinent to the specific research focus was examined, as recommended by Glaser (1978). For example, because the process of program evaluation was cited by a number of informants as being significant in changing their understanding of the innovation, the literature related to program evaluation and evaluation utilization was examined.

The literature review that follows was undertaken after data collection and analysis had begun and it focusses on the themes that emerged from the

data: (a) district capacity for innovation; (b) selection of the innovation; (c) key roles in adoption; and (d) understanding of the innovation.

Literature Review Relating to Emerging Themes

District Capacity for Innovation

Some districts adopt innovations more frequently than others. Districts with easy access to information about innovations have a wider array of innovations from which to choose. House (1974) found that, because large school districts in urban areas had greater access to ideas, they adopted more innovations.

However, districts of similar sizes and with similar levels of urbanization are not necessarily comparable in their rates of innovation. Berman and McLaughlin (1976) saw this difference in terms of problem-solving or opportunistic orientations; that is, some districts selected innovations that appeared to meet needs in the district while others selected innovations because of financial or career advancement motivations. Daft and Becker (1978) found that problem-solving districts had higher numbers of adoptions than did opportunistic districts. The problem-solving districts were actively seeking out new ideas.

"Ideas move along the social networks of personal acquaintance" (House, 1974, p. 11). The importance of repeated face-to-face contact in the adoption of innovations has long been known. Larger districts are likely to have more district level people who, in the course of their work, attend conferences and communicate in other ways with people outside the district.

The superintendent is central as a carrier and a stimulant to the information flow in the district. Carlson (1972) found that districts which saw

change as desirable tended to hire superintendents from outside the district. Carlson termed those superintendents career-bound. He found that they initiated innovations more frequently than did the place-bound superintendents who had come from inside their districts.

The histories of districts in relation to innovation also affect their willingness to adopt and implement innovations. Fullan (1982b, p. 15) stated that "districts can develop an incapacity for change as well as a capacity for it." Districts that have successfully innovated find further innovation more possible and less difficult. Districts where school improvement, as measured by student achievement, appears to be occurring have a greater capacity for planned change. Turnbull (1985) found that effective districts had a strategy for change, based on clearly identified local needs. Effective districts carefully matched resources to the planned improvement. They knew when outside resources were needed and they invested local resources in order to enhance the use of outside resources. They helped schools to coordinate improvement efforts, often by providing district level facilitators, and they helped schools to integrate new programs with existing ones.

Similar themes were discovered by Murphy and Hallinger (1988) in their study of twelve instructionally effective school districts in California. The districts were marked by positive teacher-administrator and board-superintendent relations and by a district orientation that focussed on productivity, improvement, and problem-solving. These districts' view of improvement was reflected in long term staff development plans and careful monitoring of progress. Curriculum and instruction activities in these districts were guided by tightly coupled school and district goals and strong instructional leadership from the superintendent. Organizationally, these districts exhibited a dynamic tension between district control and school

autonomy. Schools were given much autonomy in terms of input and implementation but the district exercised control in terms of decisions and outcomes. Studies by Louis (1989) and Coleman and LaRocque (1990) have reported similar findings related to the orientation to improvement in effective districts.

The orientation of the district will affect the likelihood of adoption of innovations, and the degree to which those innovations are implemented and institutionalized. Rosenholtz (1989) also found, in her study of 78 Tennessee elementary schools, that some districts had a disproportionately high percentage of effective schools. These districts were small districts which had clearly identified goals, focussed on instruction. Improvement projects were coordinated by local facilitators. There was district monitoring of school policies but there was also a high delegation of authority to principals and teachers for school goal-setting and problem-solving. The superintendent had good rapport with the school board, and there were opportunities for all educators, including the superintendent and principals, to continue their own learning.

In general, more innovations are likely to be adopted in a district with an orientation that stresses improvement and with a history of successful innovations. More innovations are also likely to be adopted where the superintendent has been hired from outside the district and where there are opportunities for the superintendent and other district staff to interact with others outside the district. Large size and urban location are district characteristics that are positively related to the number of innovations adopted but a problem-solving orientation can be present in districts of any size or location.

Selection of the Innovation

There is a large universe of educational innovations from which a district may choose; in addition, a district may choose to develop its own innovative programs or materials. Which innovations are selected for adoption depends on many factors such as central legislation or policy, nature of the innovation, perceived student needs, and career motivations of district administrators.

In Alberta, the adoption of new curricula, of new roles for educational personnel, and of programs for the education of special groups of students are regularly mandated by provincial education policy. Fullan (1982a, p. 49) noted that central legislation or policy is usually general and ambiguous. This has often been the case in Alberta. Even when implementation documents such as curriculum guides and teacher resource manuals are provided by Alberta Education, the process of change is delegated to the local school district. Timelines are laid out by Alberta Education but monitoring of the process is minimal.

In general, school districts are likely to select for adoption those innovations which do not significantly alter the allocation of resources or the structure of the organization (Pincus, 1974, cited in Fullan, 1991). Changes in content of instruction, for example, have been more readily adopted than changes in roles or in conceptions of teaching. This may help to explain why the quality or cost of innovations has not been found to be strongly related to frequency of adoption (Firestone & Herriott, 1981). In a study on innovations adopted by secondary schools, Nelson and Sieber (1976) found that some high quality and high cost innovations such as resource centres and instructional media centres were frequently adopted but other high quality and low cost innovations such as continuous progress instruction were rarely adopted. Those high quality, low cost innovations that had a low or medium frequency of

use were also those involving high admininistrative difficulty. These same innovations, such as continuous progress instruction and independent study, also involved changes in conceptions of teaching and in the roles of teachers and students in schools.

In the DESSI Study (the Study of the Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement), which examined the adoption, implementation, and institutionalization of 45 innovations in 146 school districts in the United States, Huberman and Miles (1984) found that in only a few cases were innovations adopted to solve a problem. When, however, school districts perceived that an innovation would solve a problem or enhance approaches already favored in the district, they readily adopted that innovation.

Roles in the Adoption Process

The process by which a particular innovation is selected for adoption is often lengthy and complex, and it often involves the the participation of many different people in a wide range of roles.

An innovation that is sponsored by the superintendent has a greater chance of adoption. Central office personnel have an important role to play in the decision process. Crandall (1984) pointed out in the DESSI Study that the central office administrators are usually more instrumental than school-based people in bringing about change and that they have the critical function of "scanning and monitoring on the outside and then bringing this to the attention of the building staff" (p. 19). Newton (1987), Hord (1988), and Louis (1989) found that, in rural and smaller districts, superintendents often played a critical role in the adoption of innovations.

School boards and communities rarely initiate or have a major role in deciding about district innovations (Fullan, 1991). In the minority of cases

where the school boards and community have had a strong role to play, one of two factors usually have been at work: (a) the community has undergone a significant demographic shift, or (b) the community has developed a strong negative reaction to a district innovation. Newton (1987), in a five-year study of a rural school district in Saskatchewan that had adopted multiple program changes, found that adoption was related, in addition to the leadership of the superintendent, to the availability of external funding and to "a certain amount of openness on the part of the board" (p. 20). He also noted that, in one Fall of the study, over 30 percent of the 200 motions passed by the school board were related to program matters.

Concern for program is characteristic of school boards in effective school districts. LaRocque and Coleman, from a study of ten school districts in British Columbia, reported that school boards in districts with a "productive district ethos" (1989, p. 1) had adopted numerous major initiatives directly involving or affecting a wide range of programs and practices, such as French immersion, evaluation of school personnel, evaluation of schools, and enhancement of community-school relationships. Less successful school boards had adopted fewer initiatives; those initiatives tended to focus on community-school relationships.

Teachers rarely initiate or have a major role in deciding about district innovations (Fullan, 1991). Although many teachers are involved in the adoption of innovations at the classroom and school level, the adoption of district level innovations requires the involvement and support of district level personnel such as the superintendent and the school board members.

Understanding of the Innovation

During the process of selecting and adopting an innovation, the understanding of the innovation may change considerably for those involved in the process. This phenomenon has been identified in the literature in relation to the implementation stage but it has not been explored in relation to the adoption stage.

In implementation studies, it has been found that conceptual clarity (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1979) and mutual adaptation (McLaughlin, 1976) are essential for success. Clarification is the process by which those involved in implementing the innovation develop an understanding of its nature, its critical components, and its operational aspects. Mutual adaptation is the process by which the design of the innovation is adapted to fit the environment in which it is being implemented. Clarification involves understanding the innovation; mutual adaptation involves understanding the innovation and the context. Both processes occur during the process of implementation.

Meara's study (1979) of school improvement projects which were based on the transfer of information from other school improvement projects also showed that mutual adaptation was critical to success. The projects in Meara's study were examples of the adoption and implementation of innovations not developed by the users, that is, of using outside information to change educational practice. Program evaluation can also be thought of as a means of using outside information to change educational practice. Program evaluation, when it is part of the process of adoption, can facilitate both conceptual clarity and mutual adaptation.

This view of program evaluation utilization is not universally held within the field of program evaluation (Alkin, Daillak & White, 1979). The "mainstream" perspective defines utilization of program evaluation findings in

terms of direct and immediate impact on major decisions related to the program being evaluated; the "alternative" perspective broadens the definition to include more indirect, subtle, and long term impacts. Those maintaining the mainstream perspective tend to view program evaluation as "an essential management tool" (Mackay, 1988, p. 41); successful evaluations are those which address the decision-making or problem-solving concerns of the client in a timely and credible fashion. Those favoring the alternative perspective tend to view program evaluation as "an educational task" (Cumming, 1988, p. 43); successful evaluations are those which help to enhance understandings and to assist educators to do their work more effectively and more ethically.

Leviton and Hughes (1981) have suggested that evaluations can be considered to be utilized if there is evidence that there has been an attempt to relate the evaluation findings to the issue or program under review and that people have thought or acted differently because of the evaluation. These criteria for utilization encompass the types of utilization envisioned by both the mainstream and alternative perspectives. The mainstream view of utilization focusses on instrumental use, that is, the use of findings for decision-making or problem-solving purposes. The alternative view includes conceptual use and persuasive use. Conceptual use involves the use of findings to influence people's thinking about an issue or program; persuasive use involves the use of evaluation information to develop support for or to defend a particular idea or program. In practice, however, the distinction between instrumental, conceptual, and persuasive use is hard to make, especially when decisions are reached over an extended period of time and where information from many sources is involved (Alkin, 1982). It is likely that many evaluations are utilized in a number of different ways, sometimes in ways which were not anticipated (or recognized, even in retrospect) by the evaluator or the client.

Both mainstream and alternative perspectives are useful in understanding the impact of the evaluation of a particular program. In evaluations where both perspectives are considered, the work of the evaluator will expand to encompass more than technical tasks. The evaluator may need to play political and advisory roles (Fitzpatrick, 1988), teaching and facilitating roles (Pritchard, 1983), or philosophical, ethical, or connoisseur roles (Cumming, 1988). In these roles, the evaluator is concerned as much about increased understanding and awareness as about accountability. Dawson and D'Amico (1985), in an evaluation where program developers and administrators were involved in the process, found that, in addition to operational changes, the evaluation resulted in modifications of the original conceptualizations of the program and increased commitment to the program.

Guba and Lincoln (1989) have analyzed the mainstream and alternate perspectives in terms of four "generations" or stages in the field of evaluation. The fourth generation, which they call responsive evaluation, is grounded in a contructivist paradigm. Responsive evaluation involves a collaborative process in which evaluators and program stakeholders work together to understand each other's views or constructions. Evaluation, in their view, is a sociopolitical process as well as a teaching and learning process that aims at reaching a more informed and sophisticated understanding of what is being evaluated. Through the process of developing new understanding or "reconstructions", the participants develop shared responsibility for that which is being evaluated. Shared reponsibility and negotiated understanding empower participants to take action. When "full resolution" or a shared construction is reached, action related to what is being evaluated can be taken. Where full resolution cannot be achieved, action must be deferred or a place-holding compromise may be negotiated. Either of these responses should be

made pending further study and consideration. Responsive evaluation is a recursive process that ends when time and resources are at an end or when outcomes are agreed upon. Guba and Lincoln have suggested that evaluations, if they are responsive evaluations, never end. Responsive evaluations merely pause, since even the most fully resolved evaluation holds true for only a brief time; reconsideration may become necessary whenever new information becomes available or new understanding is reached.

The adoption of an innovation is sometimes undertaken through a policy making process. This process also can be a teaching and learning process through which those involved develop a new understanding of the innovation being considered for adoption. This exploration of the meaning-making function of policy has come out of concern for the impact of research on policy (research utilization). Weiss (1977) pointed out that research has more of a conceptual impact than an instrumental impact on policy. Weiss has called this the enlightenment function of social research. Mitchell (1980), in an analysis of legislative decision making, found that research was used in the early part of the decision making process, the articulation phase, to provide a framework for thinking about the problem being addressed. Research findings were used to help define the problem and to help build group solidarity through a shared understanding of the problem and possible solutions. Coleman and LaRocque (1983) have noted that evaluation research, as a type of policy-relevant research, has had a restricted role in the policy making process. Evaluation utilization has tended to be instrumental rather than conceptual. Policy-relevant evaluation, like policy-relevant research, can serve an enlightenment function in the decision making process that leads to the adoption of a particular innovation.

Chapter Summary

Districts with a problem-solving orientation are more likely to adopt innovations. These districts will tend to select innovations that meet perceived needs. Central office administrators, especially in small or rural districts, are generally the key decision makers in the adoption process. During the process of adoption, there may be changes in the way that the innovation is understood. Program evaluation and policy making processes may facilitate changes in the understanding of the innovation, particularly when evaluators take more than a technical role and when policy makers are involved in the evaluation process.

Chapter 3

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Theoretical Orientation

This research study was designed within a constructivist or interpretist paradigm. This worldview recognizes that reality is a social construction involving multiple realities, and that knowledge is necessarily temporary, relative, and context-bound (Lincoln, 1990).

The purpose of research from the constructivist perspective is to develop a deeper understanding of a complex world. This occurs through the interaction of researcher and researched in a teaching and learning relationship. The appropriate methodologies for this type of research involve exploration of natural contexts, typically but not exclusively, utilizing qualitative rather than quantitative methodologies.

Qualitative Research Methodologies

In interpretist research, the research design cannot be completed before inquiry begins; it is developed with the participation of research informants as the inquiry proceeds. The qualitative research methodologies typically used in interpretist research rely heavily on the human as instrument (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The researcher collects data through interviewing or observing or through examining documents. The researcher analyzes data by searching for categories and themes within the data. Research informants are involved in the inquiry process from contributing to the research design to verifying the interpretation of the data.

The Case Study Approach

Yin (1989, p. 23) defined the case study as "an empirical study that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident, and in which multiple sources of evidence are used." This case study is exploratory (Yin, 1989) or interpretive (Merriam, 1988) in nature; that is, it uses descriptive data to develop conceptual categories or themes. The purpose of this description and analysis of a particular situation is to examine, develop, and share perspectives on the adoption stage of the process of planned change.

The selection of a single case allows the in-depth study which is critical in developing an understanding of a complex phenomenon. Schools and school districts are complex multifaceted organizations, open to the influences of the environments in which they exist. The change being addressed in this case study, the adoption of a cooperative integrated school library program, involves an enormous number of elements or factors. The cooperative integrated school library program itself is a complex component. It is not a single unitary innovation, but a bundle of innovations including cooperative planning, team teaching, flexible scheduling, and resource-based instructional strategies (Shields, 1989). Adoption of an innovation by a school district involves a large number of decision-makers including the superintendent, district-level consultants, and the board of trustees. These decision-makers are influenced by parents, by school-level leaders, and by ministry of education policy-makers.

The selection of a single case for this study is also a consequence of the uniqueness of the case. Although a multi-case study might have enhanced the understanding of the processes involved in the adoption of a cooperative integrated school library program, there were no other school districts in

Alberta involved in the deliberate introduction of this particular innovation at the time of the study.

Yin (1989) has pointed out that the single case study is an appropriate research design under a number of different circumstances: a) when it represents a critical case that can be used to test well-formulated theory; b) when it represents an extreme or unique case; and c) when it represents a revelatory case, that is an event or process that has not previously been accessible to research. The two latter rationales, uniqueness and revelation, are applicable to this case study of the adoption of a cooperative integrated school library model by one school district.

Selection of the Research Site

The district that was the focus of this case study is a small suburban school district in Alberta, Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District No. 105. An indication of The District's interest in making changes in its libraries came first through the channels of an informal personal school library network. This network, built throughout graduate study years at the University of Alberta, through twenty years of work in the Edmonton Public School District, and through service on the Executive Council of the Alberta Learning Resources Council, includes individuals working as teacher-librarians, school district consultants, and provincial consultants. In the Edmonton area, about fifty of these individuals are in contact regularly through association meetings, professional development activities, and informal networking events. Three of these colleagues and friends served on the team selected to evaluate The District's libraries, and I heard about their involvement at the time that I was beginning my first year of doctoral studies.

The focus of my doctoral studies has been the implementation of school library programs. The work going on in the Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District seemed to provide a very appropriate opportunity for studying in depth some aspect of planned change in relation to the improvement of school library programs. The District appeared to be making a serious commitment to change. For example, the Superintendent had requested that Alberta Education conduct an evaluation of The District's libraries. The District also was convenient in terms of travel distance and time and it had a reputation of being open to research.

Over the course of my first year's studies, a focus for the proposed research became more precisely defined. A case study approach would be used to gain understanding of The District's adoption of the cooperative integrated school library program model for its high school. Although there were libraries in each of The District's schools and some of these schools had developed instructional programs that were library-based, the cooperative integrated school library program model recommended in Alberta Education's Focus on Learning had not been adopted or implemented in the high school.

The value of selecting a positive case for study should be made clear. The researcher has been involved in about ten school library program evaluations over the past five years. Each has begun with the participants' stated intention to improve aspects of their school library program. However, in the majority of those cases, many of the recommendations presented in the evaluation reports were not carried out by the schools or school districts. There are ample examples of improvement initiatives that have failed; studying those cases has given us a good idea of all the things that can go wrong in planned change. If the school libraries in Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School district can be improved, this case study may help us to understand

something of what combination of factors can lead to success, first in adoption and later in implementation and institutionalization of the cooperative integrated school library program.

The selection of a positive case or at least a case in which there appears to be potential for success allows a researcher to identify more easily the elements which appear to be critical for success. This is particularly important when theory has not been well-developed in the area under investigation. This is the case with the theory of planned change in education where, for example, lists of factors involved have been developed but the building of models of a predictive nature is at a very tentative stage.

Data Collection

Types of Data

Three methods were used to collect data: interviewing of key informants, visiting The District, and reviewing of documents. Interviews were tape recorded and transcribed. Tape recording and transcription permitted the review and analysis of complex interview information for both factual and affective content. Field notes were kept, related to interview sessions and to visits to schools and to District Office. Official records of The District, such as annual reports of The District and minutes of school board meetings, were reviewed as were numerous memos and planning documents provided by the individuals who were interviewed in the course of the study.

The primary method of data collection was through interviews with the Superintendent; the Director, Curriculum and Instruction; the former Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum; four school-based administrators; and five school board members. Interviews with two consultants from outside The District

who had served on the school library evaluation team also provided useful information. The District Librarian who was hired, subsequent to the school library program evaluation, to develop a library program at the high school and to provide consulting services to the other seven schools in The District was also interviewed on several occasions.

Field notes were kept in relation to visits to District Office and to each of The District's schools. The initial visits were part of a followup assessment of The District's utilization of the school library program evaluation. These visits and the later ones that occurred as part of the interviewing process contributed to a deeper understanding of the district context.

Many documents relevant to the adoption of the cooperative integrated school library program model were reviewed. Pertinent documents included the report of the school library program evaluation, school and district planning documents, and materials related to the innovation history of the district.

Interviewing Method

Interviewing was selected as the primary data collection methodology for this study because it is an especially powerful way to explore complex and context-specific phenomena. The information essential to gaining an understanding of The District's decision to make changes in its libraries could not have been obtained in any other way. Interviewing allowed access to data from past events, through the interpretations of many participants.

The interviews were retrospective in nature. The individuals interviewed were asked to recall events of the recent past. A semi-structured interview approach was used. Because the number of individuals interviewed was relatively large and the nature of the information sought was quite broad in scope, the initial interview sessions were focussed on a series of questions.

The interview schedule for the initial interviews with key informants (Appendix A) included questions related to the informants' background, their understanding of the role of the school libraries, and their knowledge of why and how The District made changes that affected The District's libraries. All informants were also asked to comment on what factors might have facilitated or constrained the changes.

Fifteen individuals were interviewed during the course of the study (Appendix E). Several informants were interviewed more than once. Each initial interview session began with a review of the purpose of the interview, the reasons for the informant being selected, and a confirmation of the roles of the informant and the researcher including their respective rights in terms of the collection, analysis, and dissemination of data and findings.

Role of Informants

The individuals who participated in the interviews acted as informants, rather than as interviewees (Dobbert, 1982); that is, the informants were constructing the data with the researcher through the conversation of the interview. The informants were active agents in the interview process, not passive providers of data. Their strong interest in what was being discussed has undoubtedly shaped the interview data.

Informants' perceptions of the situation are shaped by the identities they perceive in themselves and in others, what Hammersley and Atkinson (1983, p. 118) term the "latent identities" of the informants and the researcher. These unspoken identities may have been affected by the time and place of the interviews. Most interviews took place in the informants' offices during working hours; a few took place in their homes after working hours. Neither of these represent intrinsically better or worse situations but each had the

potential to have affected the identities that the participants perceived at the time of the interviews and thus the nature of the data collected.

Role of the Researcher

Throughout the research process, it was necessary for me to examine my role as researcher. I tried to be aware of the experiences that have directed my thinking about the research questions and, indeed, how I came to be interested in this particular study. For example, I have long played an evaluative and advocacy role in the field of school librarianship. At times, I experienced some difficulty setting aside those roles in order to understand the situation and the roles of those involved. I am certain that I was perceived, in some situations, as an insider and at those times I had some difficulty getting explicit, detailed information since the informants appeared to assume that I had more information than I did. In other instances, it was hard for me to lay aside long-held interpretations and to be open to new interpretations.

As a researcher, I tried to view each interview as a process in which I was working as a co-participant in developing a deeper understanding of the topic under consideration. For example, I recognized that all of the relevant questions could not be ascertained before the interviews began, and that the informants would have a role in shaping the interview process. As the initial interview schedule shows, at the time of the first interviews I had not yet defined a precise time demarcation for the study. The schedule addresses a much longer time frame than this thesis addresses. The interview process helped me to set more narrowly the parameters of the study.

Data Analysis

The data were coded and analyzed using the content analysis approach recommended by Berg (1989). This approach involved a systematic combing of the transcipts, field notes, and other documents and a thorough immersion in the data until themes began to emerge. The units and categories of data were not defined before the data were examined. When the data had been thoroughly examined, coding frames, that is, ways to organize data and identify findings, were determined. Successive sorting of the data using those coding frames allowed themes to arise from the data.

Ethical Considerations

Throughout this research undertaking, there were ethical considerations to be addressed. Two issues, one related to confidentiality and anonymity and one related to the transformation of meaning through the process of creating text, posed problems that had to be addressed by the researcher and the informants throughout the study.

Because interviewing was the primary data collection method, the traditional approaches of informed consent and protection of subjects from harm were necessary but not sufficient. Particular care had to be taken in terms of confidentiality of information because there was the possibility that the researcher could have gained access to information that might be harmful to individual informants if inadvertently shared with others. Because of the uniqueness of the case, it would have been very difficult for the key informants and the case site to remain anonymous even with pseudonyms and extensive alteration of the case description. Furthermore, hiding the identity of the case and the informants could have limited the readers' understanding the work and its implications (Yin, 1989).

The second complex issue, both ethical and epistemological, related to the transforming of oral language into written text. This included transforming conversation into transcripts, identifying themes and categories, and presenting the research findings in thesis form. Each of these transformations changed the nature of the communication and affected meanings and understandings.

Both issues affected the rights of the informants in relation to data collection, analysis and dissemination. These issues were addressed, as much as was possible, in several ways. First, all informants were asked to give their consent formally by means of a Consent Form (Appendix B). The possibility of identifying The District by name in the final thesis was explored with the key informants at the time of their interviews. At the completion of the data collection phase of the research, The District gave formal consent to identification by name in the thesis (Appendix E).

More difficult questions were posed by concerns related to the identification of individual informants and to the use and interpretation of interview data in the thesis. The dilemmas were explored with the informants. Because of the small size of The District, some would be readily identified by their position title alone. Most were willing to be identified by name in the thesis, and some were pleased with the recognition implied for what they perceived as a District success story.

The dilemmas involved were explored with the informants and they were given the opportunity to review a draft of the thesis (Appendix D). In addition, all informants were provided with copies of the sections of thesis containing direct quotes and/or paraphrases from their interviews in order that they could review and revise, if required, the use and interpretation of the information they had provided.

Research Trustworthiness

Although, as Dobbert points out (1982, p. 259), "absolute validity and reliability cannot be obtained in any science", trustworthiness is as important in qualitative research as it is in quantitative research. Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest four criteria for trustworthiness: (a) credibility, (b) transferability, (c) dependability, and (d) confirmability.

Credibility has been enhanced through prolonged engagement, persistent observation, triangulation, and member checks. Data collection in The District began in May 1990 and continued for over a year until July 1991. A diverse group of informants was selected; key informants worked at various levels in The District and other informants were selected on their recommendation as representing a wide range of views on the case. A wide range of data sources was consulted, and information from different sources was used to verify data on many occasions. Questions that arose in one source or instance were checked against other sources. Informants reviewed the final draft of the thesis and, in particular, those aspects where their data had been used.

Transferability has been enhanced by providing a detailed description of the case including the characteristics and history of The District. On the basis of the information provided, those interested in making a transfer will be able to decide whether or not transferability to another case is possible.

Dependability and confirmability have been increased by reporting the methods used to collect and analyze the case data and by keeping an audit trail, that is, files of raw data, analysis tools, categories, and other research items that are open to scrutiny. The case data base (Appendix E) outlines the sources of data used in the study.

Chapter Summary

This study of how and why the Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District No. 105 adopted the cooperative integrated school library program model for its high school was designed and carried out as a case study. The case study was grounded in a constructivist orientation and qualitative research methodologies were used to conduct the study. The research informants were active participants in the study, from research design to interpretation of the research data. Trustworthiness of the case study findings has been enhanced through careful collection of data from many sources over an extended time, through review of data and findings by informants, and by provision of records of the case data base.

Chapter 4

CASE DESCRIPTION

The School District

Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District No. 105 is a suburban school district located in Alberta to the east of Edmonton. It serves about 3000 students from Kindergarten to Grade 12, in eight schools. The District was formed in 1962 as Salisbury Roman Catholic School District No. 105. It began with one school of 240 students from grades one to nine in Sherwood Park. The District has grown rapidly with the growth of population in the urban area of Sherwood Park and with the incorporation of a number of small rural Catholic districts. The District now extends over about two-thirds of the geographic area of the County of Strathcona. The public school system, the County of Strathcona Board of Education, serves about 12,000 students, in 28 schools.

The Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District is governed by a seven member Board of Trustees. During the 1987-1990 term, the Board included four trustees employed in the education sector. Three of the four are employed by the Edmonton Catholic School Board; the fourth was formerly a teacher in Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District and is now on faculty at the University of Alberta.

The financial base of The District has always been problemmatic:

> Originally it started as Salisbury Catholic which was just Sherwood Park. That's long before my time, but then the Catholic families living outside Sherwood Park who were sending their kids in here, their taxes were going to the county public system because there was not a Catholic district out there. (Superintendent, Interview)

> They started this system on a shoestring. They never did have enough money to build proper buildings, put in proper libraries and labs . . . so you learned to accept that and do with what was there. (Principal, Interview)

By the early 1980s, the financial problems had reached very serious proportions, primarily as a result of school building costs. The District went to Alberta Education for assistance in assessing the problem. The District then set out a long range operational and financial plan intended to alleviate The District's difficulties. The resulting plan has enabled The District to gain a firmer financial footing.

In recent years, the additional funds provided to The District through the Association for the Advancement of Catholic Education (AACE) has allowed The District some extra flexibility. AACE allocates the taxes collected by Castle Catholic School District No. 248 (hereafter referred to as Castle) to Fort Saskatchewan Catholic Board of Education and to Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District. Castle is a school district without a school. It covers a four mile by four mile area of extensive industrial development. Before Castle's formation, the taxes collected from the property owners of that area went to the County of Strathcona and therefore to the public school system, although the Catholic children of the area were being educated in the two Catholic school systems within the boundaries of the County of Strathcona.

Initially, the monies were directly transferred from Castle to the two other Catholic school districts. The new School Act, passed by the Government of Alberta in 1990, does not allow direct transfers of this sort; sharing of resources can only be done through joint projects or organizations. The Castle Catholic, Fort Saskatchewan Catholic, and Sherwood Park Catholic Separate

School Districts formed AACE to share resources for their special education programs.

The additional monies accessed by Sherwood Catholic Separate School District from the Castle Catholic School District and through AACE have amounted to approximately $1,141,000 over a three year period, beginning in the 1988-1989 school year. These additional monies have allowed Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District to make available about $395,000 over a three year period for the improvement of its school libraries.

Early Development of The District's Libraries

In the early days of The District, libraries had grown in each school, primarily through donation of materials and using volunteer help. There were also many classroom libraries, collections built up by individual teachers through purchases from personal funds.

Efforts to improve The District's libraries go back many years. In 1973 a Consultant was hired with responsibility for Curriculum and Resources. Over a five year period, each school's library was reorganized using standardized library procedures and, with start-up money from Alberta Education's Educational Opportunity Fund grants, library clerks were hired for all the schools. In the late 1970s the nature of the Consultant's responsibilities changed to include acquiring property and building schools, and the district level involvement in libraries gradually diminished.

In 1985, with the publication by Alberta Education of the document, Focus on Learning, there was a resurgence in The District of interest related to libraries: "Activity was initiated in October 1985 that had as its purpose to consider the possible implementation of Alberta Education's recommended model for developing an effective integrated school library program" (Annual

Report, 1986). Awareness Seminars were sponsored by Alberta Education to familiarize school districts with the Focus on Learning document and to encourage implementation of its recommendations. A number of principals from The District attended these workshops. For instance, three principals participated in the February 14, 1986 workshop for principals in schools without teacher-librarians. This workshop, entitled "The Heart of the School - Has It Stopped Beating," was designed to help principals to better understand the Focus on Learning cooperative integrated library program model and to plan for the effective use of the Learning Resources Grant provided by Alberta Education for the upgrading of library collections.

The Learning Resources Grant was made available in 1986 to each district in Alberta on the basis of $10.00 per student, with a minimum of $1000.00 per school, on the condition that the district have in place a school library policy and a plan for utilizing the grant. The schools in Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District used the funding to purchase media materials including books and computer software for their libraries.

Some schools in The District followed up the Awareness Seminars with staff workshops and in at least one school the principal initiated the development of library-based curriculum-integrated units of instruction. It appears, however, that no district direction was given in relation to the implementation of the Focus on Learning model. This was at the time when the current superintendent was appointed, and when the priority of The District was dealing with its financial problems:

> I had come from a setting where the library was quite a vibrant part of the school operation and when I came here I found that the collections were poor and the use of the libraries was minimal. The District was financially really unable to address many problem areas that they had at that time but I resolved to get the libraries evaluated by somebody who knew a lot more about libraries than I

> did, when I was able to begin to see some financial light at the end of the tunnel. As I recall, I brought it on to the table [to the principals and to the school board] in the beginning of 1986. We discussed it, but there were so many other things that had to be dealt with that we just never got around to dealing with it at that time. (Superintendent, Interview)

When the financial problems of The District were somewhat ameliorated, the Superintendent turned more of his attention to curricular matters. The Director, Curriculum and Instruction, who had had some experience with innovative programs, joined the staff of District Office in the Fall of 1987. This position of Director, Curriculum and Instruction, had been newly created through a re-structuring of District Office:

> About eight months after I became superintendent, the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum retired, and I decided not to have that position anymore. What I decided to do was to turn it into a director's position and rotate staff with various expertise, out of the classroom into an administrative position. When we were looking at bringing someone into that new position, [libraries] was one of the areas that we made a commitment to address. So when the new person came in, he knew that that was one of the areas we were going to pursue. (Superintendent, Interview)

The position of Director, Curriculum and Instruction, was designed as a term position in order to allow more flexibility in bringing curriculum expertise into District Office in accordance with changing district needs.

School Library Program Evaluation

The District had been regularly evaluating curricular programs. The science program had been identified as an area of concern in the district in the 1986-1987 School-Based Goals and Objectives (Annual Report, 1986-1987). It was the initiative of the Superintendent that put the evaluation of The District's library program on the priority list.

After a meeting with the Acting Director of the Edmonton Regional Office of Alberta Education on October 27, 1987, the Superintendent requested Alberta Education involvement in a district-wide library program evaluation:

> During the course of our conversation we discussed the status of our libraries and my desire to have someone with librarian/learning resources centre experience to undertake a thorough evaluation of each of our school libraries. (Letter, Superintendent to Acting Director of Edmonton Regional Office)

However, the library program evaluation could not be carried out until early in the following school year because of the workload of the Alberta Education consultant who would participate in the evaluation. The library program evaluation became one of the major goals of The District for the 1988-1989 school year. This goal appeared in sixth place on a list of fourteen: "To evaluate the District's library and science programs" (Annual Report, 1988-1989, p. 6).

The Consultant for Libraries and Media from the Edmonton Regional Office of Alberta Education met with the Superintendent and Director on September 8, 1988 to establish the terms of reference for the evaluation. These were:

1. To determine the extent to which teachers incorporate the use of the library into their programs.

2. To assess the quality and quantity of learning resources in each school.

3. To assess the suitability of the library facility for the program in each school.

4. To determine the direction for system and school-based library policies and plans.

5. To help determine the relationship between the role of the Learning Resources Centre in central office and the school libraries. (School Library Program Evaluation Report, p. 1)

The Superintendent emphasized to the Alberta Education Consultant that The District wanted the evaluation to take a hard look at the situation. The Superintendent recognized that there was little expertise in The District in the area of school libraries. Three external evaluators were identified: the Consultant in Libraries and Media from the Edmonton Regional Office of Alberta Education; the Educational Media Consultant from the Edmonton Catholic School District; and the Director, Centre de documentation, Faculté Saint-Jean, University of Alberta. Their work in The District was coordinated and scheduled by the Director, Curriculum and Instruction. As the planning proceeded, the role of the Director, Curriculum and Instruction, in the evaluation process expanded from that of coordinator to that of evaluator. By the time the school visits began, the Director, Curriculum and Instruction, had become a full and active active member of the evaluation team.

The major part of the evaluation process took place October 7-14, 1988. For four days, the team visited the eight schools, spending one-half day at each school. The team members rotated their roles, interviewing the principal and the library staff, interviewing a sample of the teachers in each school, and spending time in the library facility evaluating the collection, observing use of the facility, and talking informally with students and teachers. At the end of each school visit, the team members compared notes and began to develop commendations and recommendations for the school. The final day was spent developing the first draft of the evaluation report. The evaluation team member from the Faculté Saint-Jean was unavailable to work with the team that week. Since her part of the evaluation focused on the French Immersion school, she was able to do her work separately and her contribution was integrated into the final report.

Fourteen recommendations were included in the School Library Program Evaluation Report:

1. A district policy be developed immediately.

2. Principals with their staff develop a school library policy, collection development plan, and budget.

3. Additional funding be considered to upgrade collections but contingent upon a school policy, collection development plan, and budget.

4. Long-range plans be developed to provide for student access to technology and media resources in library collections.

5. Teacher-librarian services be considered at the district level or as part of the Curriculum Resources Bank to assist in implementation of the Focus on Learning Model and the recommendations of this evaluation.

6. Inservice sessions be organized for principals, teachers, and library personnel so that they can become more familiar with the philosophy of school library service, concepts of resource-based learning, and cooperative planning.

7. Teachers plan and conduct meaningful lessons using library resources to achieve curricular goals.

8. Programming emphasis be shifted from a stand-alone fiction program to an integrated program of information skills, planned and delivered by teachers, under the leadership of the principal to ensure continuity of expectations.

9. The Learning Resources Centre provide coordination for the ordering and processing of resources for the schools, meetings and inservices for library staff, and purchase of expensive media kits and selection aids.

10. Central Office administration review the policy for library staffing and the title given to library personnel.

11. Library materials be selected from recognized sources and the majority of items purchased from jobbers rather than bookstores.

12. Curriculum Resources Bank personnel be asked to provide recommendations for curriculum-related resources.

13. St. Theresa, Our Lady of Perpetual Help, Madonna, and Archbishop Jordan Schools remove old and outdated materials from their collections.

14. Plans be made for library facility improvements at Archbishop Jordan, St. Theresa, and Father Kenneth Kearns Schools. (School Library Program Evaluation Report, pp. 13-14)

The School Library Program Evaluation Report was presented to the Board of Trustees on December 12, 1988 by the Associate Director and the Consultant for Libraries and Media from the Edmonton Regional Office of Alberta Education.

The Board responded with many questions and comments. The recommendation with which the evaluation team had had the greatest concern and difficulty was that related to teacher-librarian services at the district level. That recommendation came up for discussion at the board meeting:

> Now [the evaluation team] had indicated as one of the recommendations that they consider ways of getting a teacher-librarian as a consultant, perhaps through their consultants' bank because they belong to a consortium of smaller Catholic districts. They had a language arts consultant and a science consultant and a math consultant at that time. We suggested that if they added a teacher-librarian consultant for a period of time that that would be a benefit to all of these districts, but we had not made the direct suggestion that they have a teacher-librarian. . . . I was still operating with the Superintendent's admonition that recommending teacher-librarians was going to be a waste of time. Then I came to the Board with the final report and it was at the board meeting that one of the trustees said, 'What would be wrong with hiring a teacher-librarian that would work in our high school and give some support to the other schools?' So it was an interesting change in events there. . . . And, of course, we picked it up right away. . . . I thought it was a marvelous idea and why hadn't we thought of it! (Evaluator, Interview)

As the Evaluator's comments reveal, the evaluation team was surprised when the Trustee suggested an alternative that went beyond the report recommendation, that is, that a teacher-librarian be hired for a dual role, to

provide consultative services for the district and to serve as the on-site teacher-librarian for the high school.

The response of District Office to the School Library Program Evaluation Report might be characterized as having a "bias for action" for there was little time lost in acting upon the recommmendations. The first recommemndation of the report was the development of a district policy. In the week following the evaluation, the Director met with the Consultant for Libraries and Media at the Edmonton Regional Office of Alberta Education to review the first draft of a library policy for The District. The Superintendent quickly developed a draft action plan for implementation of the report's recommendations.

At the January 9, 1989 meeting of the Board of Trustees, the Board officially undertook "a major project to upgrade all school libraries" (Board Highlights, January 1989) and announced a notice of motion to establish a District Library Policy. Also at that meeting, an Administrative Action Plan was presented by the Superintendent, outlining timelines for a school libraries upgrading project.

The Board of Trustees gave final approval to the District Library Policy on May 8, 1989. The policy stated:

> The Board of Trustees recognizes that students in its schools should have access to an effective school library program that is integrated into the instructional programs to improve opportunities for student achievement of the Goals of Basic Education for the Province of Alberta and the learning expectations of the Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School System. (Board Minutes)

At this point, the integrated school library program model was officially adopted by The District for all of its schools. By its decision to hire a District Librarian to work as a teacher-librarian at the high school, also finalized at this time, the Board adopted, for the high school, the cooperative integrated school library program model. The cooperative integrated school library program

model, recommended in Focus on Learning, is based upon the development, by the cooperative planning and teaching of the teachers and a teacher-librarian, of an instructional program, integrated with the curriculum.

In the 1988-1989 Annual Report of The District, both the Chairman of the Board of Trustees and the Superintendent note The District's efforts to improve school libraries. Although the Annual Report does not elaborate upon the nature of the improvements, it is interesting to note that no other of the Chairman's or Superintendent's Annual Reports throughout the 1980s made any mention of school libraries. Clearly, the change was of some significance to The District leadership.

A teacher-librarian was seconded from the County of Strathcona Board of Education for the position of District Librarian for September of 1989. The implementation of the innovation has proceeded through the 1989-1990 and 1990-1991 school years. The initial implementation efforts within The District are outlined briefly in Chapter 10 Epilogue and will be the focus of several future studies.

Chapter Summary

Over the first thirty years of its history, the school libraries in the Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District have gone through a number of changes. During the first decade, the sixties, a time of rapid growth for The District, libraries were established through donation and volunteer help. In the seventies, the libraries were organized according to standardized library practice and support staff were hired to operate them. After this reorganization effort under the leadership of District Office staff, the initiative to improve libraries could not be sustained for a variety of reasons. However, with the establishment of a provincial school library policy in 1984 and with the

amelioration of The District's financial difficulties, The District once again began to look at its libraries. The support of the Superintendent and the Board of Trustees for the recommendations of the 1988 School Library Program Evaluation Report resulted in the official approval of a District School Library Policy. The Policy and the decision to hire a District Librarian signalled The District's adoption of the cooperative integrated school library program model for the high school.

Chapter 5

FINDINGS: DISTRICT CAPACITY FOR INNOVATION

Four major themes emerged from the analysis of the case study data base. Chapters 5-9 present the findings of the case study in relation to the four themes: a) district capacity for innovation, b) selection of libraries as a focus for change, c) key roles in the adoption process, and d) understanding of the innovation.

The nature of the Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District facilitated the adoption process. Four characteristics of The District were of particular importance in relation to its capacity for innovation: a) The District had a history of initiating innovations; b) it had a problem-solving rather than a bureaucratic orientation; c) it was a small district with a relatively cohesive culture; and d) beginning in 1988, it had access to new funding.

Innovation History of The District

Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District has been involved in several major innovative projects over its history, many of them successful; that is, they have become institutionalized as integral parts of The District's organization and practice.

In the 1970s and 1980s, The District took innovative initiatives in the areas of media utilization, secondary school scheduling, centralized media services, second language immersion and bilingual education, community school programming, and consulting services. At the individual school level, there have been many curriculum pilot projects carried out in cooperation with Alberta Education. In the past few years, some schools have been

experimenting with cooperative learning techniques and many have implemented aspects of what is commonly referred to as whole language.

Innovation Successes

The majority of the innovative projects begun in the 1970s and 1980s appear to have been successful. That is, they became and remain vital aspects of The District. Central Alberta Media Services (CAMS), developed in response to the 1976 decision by the Government of Alberta to decentralize its film distribution service (Malone, 1980), continues to provide media distribution services for school districts in Central Alberta. French immersion, begun in 1979, is offered from kindergarten to grade ten; Ukrainian bilingual, begun in 1980, is offered from kindergarten to grade ten.

In 1981, one of The District's schools was designated as a community school by Alberta Education. The school continues to receive special funding to develop community education programs. Recently, The District took a strong leadership role in the development of a Curriculum Resources Bank by a consortium of 12 small Catholic school districts in Central Alberta (Fraietta & McBride, 1989). The Curriculum Resource Bank, a team of four teacher-consultants seconded from their districts, offers consulting services to meet the curriculum implementation needs of the teachers and administrators of the schools within the consortium.

Three of the innovation projects that have been successful for The District have aspects that relate to the critical components of the cooperative integrated school library program model. CAMS, like a school library, provides access to a centralized collection of resources for teaching and learning. A community school program, like a school library program, expands the environment for teaching and learning beyond the classroom. Both the

community school program and the Curriculum Resources Bank, like the school library program, encourage teachers to work together in the implementation of curriculum.

Two Innovation Failures

In the 1970s there was much interest in using media and technology to change in major ways the roles of teachers and students in schooling. In Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District and in many school districts throughout Alberta at the time, there was, along with the effort to reorganize libraries, a general thrust for increased use of nonprint media. Schools in The District attempted to change traditional book-oriented libraries into media centres, but this effort was shortlived. At the district level there was also a high level of support for, and involvement in, a consortium for educational television production. Eventually that too lost its momentum with the entry of the provincial government into the educational television market and with the economic downturn of the early 1980s.

A second innovation failure was the Jordan Plan. The Plan was introduced in The District's secondary school, Archbishop Jordan Junior-Senior High School in September 1973. It involved the rescheduling of the traditional five-day instructional week into four days. This was seen to offer a number of advantages to both students and teachers. Students could use the free day, Wednesday, to use community resources or to access professional services. Teachers could use the time for departmental planning or consultation with parents and students. It was also felt at the time that students should be prepared to face a future where they would have much more leisure time. Some activities for students were offered in conjunction with the County of Strathcona Recreation Department and utilized facilities outside the school but

participation was not mandatory. After about five years the Jordan Plan was disbanded, primarily due to parental concerns related to how students were using their non-classroom time (Kunjbehari, 1981).

Effect of Innovation History on Innovation Capacity

Research shows that districts that have a history of innovation, particularly successful innovation, usually continue to innovate. The District's capacity for change has been increased by experiences of success in planned change. Organizations, like individuals, tend to continue activities that have had positive outcomes. In addition, because of the nature of some of these successful innovations, The District has institutionalized some of the components that are critical to the cooperative integrated school library program, namely, teachers working together to use resources beyond those of the classroom to enhance teaching and learning.

The two innovation failures also have aspects that are related to the critical components of the cooperative integrated school library program, those related to the use by teachers and students of information resources and time resources. The media utilization projects were attempts to provide access to a wide range of resources for teaching and learning, particularly audiovisual and technological resources. The Jordan Plan was an attempt to provide greater variety and flexibility in the ways that teachers and students organized themselves for teaching and learning, through shifts in time use and also through shifts in teacher and student groupings. For teachers, there was more opportunity to work together in planning. For students, there was more opportunity to work alone or, if they wished, in small groupings of their own choosing. The cooperative integrated school library program involves teachers planning, teaching, and evaluating in pairs or teams; it may involve students

working in a wide variety of groupings from individual to large group. The cooperative integrated school library program also may involve use of audiovisual and technological resources by teachers and students.

Both of these failed innovation projects had within them the potential for shifting, in some small ways, the roles of teachers and students in teaching and learning. Those shifts would have brought the roles of teachers and students closer to those encouraged by the cooperative integrated school library program model. The media utilization projects could have put more resources, particularly those of an audiovisual or technological nature, in the hands of students. The Jordan Plan could have allowed secondary students more autonomy in their learning, for at least one day each week.

Although failed innovation projects tend to decrease capacity for innovation, there were several factors that limited their negative impact within The District, on innovation projects generally and on the cooperative integrated school library program in particular. The Jordan Plan became an issue of major proportions in The District, so much so that a team of outside evaluators was called in to assess the project. The public discussion of the project raised many questions for those involved in its adoption and implementation. However, as is discussed later in this chapter, the failure of the Jordan Plan was interpreted by many at the district level as an opportunity for learning how to be more successful in implementing future innovation projects. Although The District's libraries had not become media centres nor had students gained more access to audiovisual and technological resources, those resources continued to be available for teacher use through school purchase or through loan from CAMS and from other sources outside The District.

Another factor that may have limited the negative impact of the failed innovations was the way in which the roles of teachers and students are

traditionally defined in schools. Because teachers are generally viewed as having almost all the decision-making reponsibility in teaching and learning, the potential of these innovations for changing that role even minimally was not apparently recognized. Although the cooperative integrated school library program model has the potential for a similar shift in the responsibilities for teaching and learning, that potential also is often not recognized. The loss, through the failure of the media utilization projects and of the Jordan Plan, of that potential for increased student responsibilities in teaching and learning was not recognized because it was more of a loss for students than for teachers. The failure of these two innovations did not represent a major loss for teachers. In fact, the failure represented a confirmation of the role of the teacher as central to teaching and learning. However, because the Focus on Learning model does not explicitly challenge this conception of the role of the teacher, the model could not be, and was not, seen as a radical innovation by its advocates within and outside The District.

The limited negative impact of innovation failure may be understood, in the case of the Jordan Plan, as the interpretation of failure as an opportunity for learning by some leaders in The District. In the media utilization case, failure appears to have been seen as a very small loss because the innovation was gradually redefined in ameliorative terms, rather than in its original radical terms of changing roles in teaching and learning.

Orientation of The District

School districts can be characterized, in terms of their orientation to innovation, as problem-solving or opportunistic. In reviewing the innovation history of Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District, a problem-solving orientation emerges. Each of the innovations outlined above began with a

perceived need. Although some innovation projects allowed The District to access external funding, none came about solely because of financial incentives.

This problem-solving orientation is also clear in The District's use of system, program, and school evaluations. During the 1980s, The District worked with Alberta Education to complete a significant number of evaluations. In 1985 The District requested a system evaluation in order to find ways to address the severe financial difficulties that it was facing. The Ukrainian bilingual and French immersion programs were evaluated in 1987. The science and library programs in all schools were evaluated in 1988. School evaluations were completed for St. Luke's School in 1988 and for Archbishop Jordan High School in 1989.

This problem-solving orientation can also be seen in the way The District has customarily used committees in addressing changes in curricula:

> The only way that individuals can take ownership for any kind of problem or any kind of change or any kind of process is by being directly involved. So, with each of the new curriculums that we get as a result of Alberta Education changing, I form a curriculum committee with representatives from all the schools and it's with these people that I begin to deal with the changes. I talk about the changes, point out what the needs are, and how they [committee members] can be the communication link back to the schools. (Director, Interview)

A problem-solving orientation was also evident in the attitudes expressed about problems in The District. The Alberta Education evaluations were viewed as means to find the best possible ways to solve problems or to improve programs. Several of individuals emphasized in their interviews that "getting the facts" and "doing it right" were characteristic of The District:

> The commitment was that the system was going to improve and that, if the money was there, it wasn't going to be squandered, we

> would get the proper expertise. I think there was a commitment on all sides that if we're going to do this, let's do it right and let's look to the future. (Trustee, Interview)

The District was confident of its own ability to find solutions but it also had the wisdom to know when expertise was lacking within The District and when outside expertise would be appropriate. This was the case with the adoption of the cooperative integrated school library program model by The District. The inadequacies of The District's libraries had long been of concern to the Superintendent and to some trustees, principals, and teachers. The problem-solving orientation of The District meant that a careful and systematic approach would be taken to addressing those inadequacies when those individuals believed that the resources needed to address those inadequacies might be available. That problem-solving approach would include the use of the outside expertise of the Alberta Education school library program evaluation team.

Culture of The District

The Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District is a small district, serving about 3000 students and located within a small geographic area. The District and the community it serves share a religion, and about half of the teaching staff working within The District are members of the same parish, Our Lady of Perpetual Help Parish, in Sherwood Park. There are a number of people working in The District now who grew up in the area and who attended schools in The District. In the early years, when The District was growing quickly, many young teachers were hired, most of whom have remained with The District. Almost all of the principals and senior administrators live within the area served by The District.

The close-knit nature of The District is evident in the nature of the communication channels within The District. The informal communication channels appear to be particularly efficient: "Our schools are really good at communicating with each other about how they run things so there's a lot of commonality amongst our schools. The principals talk to each other often" (Director, Interview). Teachers also communicate frequently, with teachers in their own schools and with those in other schools in The District. For example, it was evident to the Evaluators that teachers interviewed during the school library program evaluation process shared their perceptions with each other and with others who had not been interviewed.

Formal communication channels within the District also appear to be good:

> The schools send out their own newsletters on a monthly basis. The District sends a newsletter attached to the parish bulletin following each public meeting [of the Board of Trustees]. We have public meetings every second Monday and it goes out in the Sunday bulletin. It's a mini report of what happened in the previous meeting and it's information regarding the agenda of the coming meeting. (Director, Interview)

The principals also meet with District Office staff at twice monthly Administration Meetings. There is a strong sense of working together, of making a joint effort, particularly within the district leadership:

> In 1985 when deficits were drastic, all staff pulled together and we pulled through all right. . . . We've been through some tough times as a district, very interesting, very challenging times. . . . We knew there were shortcomings in our libraries. . . . We did a lot of research and a lot of soul searching. . . . The staff gave us the facts. They had input and we worked together. When we venture out on a project, we do it together. (Trustee, Interview)

The location of The District, close to several very large school districts and to the provincial capital and the offices of the provincial department of education, means that, although it is a very cohesive stable community, it is

not an isolated community. It has easy access to a wide pool of ideas and expertise, and it has made use of that pool of ideas and expertise through regular and frequent interactions with Alberta Education, the County of Strathcona Board of Education, and the Edmonton Catholic School District as well as other smaller school districts. Most of the principals and senior administration have had extensive experience outside The District, and those interviewed appear to have maintained those contacts developed in previous years in other school districts.

The culture of Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District was conducive to the introduction and exploration of new ideas. This culture facilitated the development of interest in and support for the cooperative integrated school library program model.

District Capacity for Innovation

The number of innovative thrusts in the last two decades of its history suggests that The District is a fertile ground for innovation. Districts that have been involved in innovation are more likely to continue to be involved in innovation; this appears to be the case for Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District.

Successful innovation generally increases a district's willingness to continue to innovate. Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District has had more successes than failures. It has experienced successful innovation in areas such as immersion and bilingual language education, centralized media services, community school programming, and curriculum consultation services. On the other hand, initiatives in the areas of media utilization and secondary school scheduling were not successful.

The failure of an innovation does not automatically decrease capacity for innovation; the response to failure is also a very important factor. The responses to the failure of the media utilization initiative and of the Jordan Plan were different, and their impacts on The District's capacity to try other innovative projects, such as the one to improve its libraries, differed as well. The media utilization thrust lost its momentum gradually and without much public notice; that was not the case for the secondary school scheduling project.

The quiet demise of the media utilization thrust may have had some negative impact on The District's interest in school libraries. Some in The District saw the proposals to improve libraries as a dubious endeavour, based on their earlier experiences with media utilization. Several principals had been actively involved in trying to implement a media approach in their school libraries in the 1970s but "after that push, it went right back into books again, so the principals were a little apprehensive. It was 'Okay, I don't know if I can buy into this because I did this once before' and so they see things as being very cyclical" (Interview, District Librarian).

In contrast, the failure of the Jordan Plan was explored publicly through meetings and a formal evaluation. This experience appears to have provided an opportunity for learning within The District. For example, the Director who had worked for two years as a Jordan Plan coordinator recalled his reaction to the cancellation of the Plan:

> I said to myself, 'What did we do wrong with this? Why didn't it go on?' And I learned about community education as a result. We had been doing a lot of things [through the Jordan Plan] that might be done in community education. I decided to find out more about it and started taking university courses. (Director, Interview)

> The Jordan Plan was ahead of its time. . . . It was based on sound principles but it was not understood by all. It was a change that we were not comfortable with . . . but libraries were something parents could relate to, grasp right away. (Trustee, Interview)

> There was such a wide consensus that something had to be done, that libraries were such a weak link. . . . There was unanimity. On this one, you can learn from our strengths. The Jordan Plan is where we learned from our mistakes and other boards can learn from that. (Trustee, Interview)

Although some of the individuals who were interviewed occasionally grumbled about the lack of communication, trust, and understanding among the community, The District, and the schools, there appeared to be a cohesiveness within The District and a belief that all work together for the good of all. The leadership role was generally understood to be shared by many and this appeared to have been the case in practice. For example, a variety of players have been the catalysts for change in The District. The language programs have been developed in response to initiatives from parent groups. Within The District, initiatives for change have come from individuals and groups at both school and district levels. The innovation that is the focus of this study, a cooperative integrated school library program model, came about as a result of concerns about the libraries in all of The District's schools. These concerns were shared by many within The District and the community it serves.

Access to New Funding

The money accessed by The District from the Castle Catholic School District was important in creating the opportunity for change, but it was not the only new funding that had come into The District for libraries during the 1980s. In 1986-1988, a Learning Resources Grant was made available by Alberta Education to all districts in the province in the form of a one-time-only grant for improving library collections. The grant for Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District amounted to about $30,000.

The funding accessed by The District from the Castle Catholic School District was considerably more substantial than the Learning Resources Grant

and it raised expectations within The District that major improvements were possible. The areas for improvement were selected very carefully. "The Board decided that the Castle money would be spent in a way to benefit all students but not in a way that the District would become dependent on it" (Trustee, Interview). That meant that the funding would be directed toward capital expenditures or special projects, but not toward change that might be difficult to reverse or cancel, such as reducing the pupil-teacher ratio by hiring additional teachers at the school level.

Using some of this new funding to improve the school libraries of The District fit those spending parameters well. The District could direct the funding to improving the quality of school library collections without changing current budgeting practices or teaching practices. Students would benefit from having access to more and better resources, but this would be an ameliorative change that would not have any negative repercussions if the funding diappeared in the years to come.

Chapter Summary

Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District had a high capacity for innovation. It had been involved in a number of innovative initiatives. Many of those have been continued over a extended period of time; they have been institutionalized in The District. Only a few of The District's innovative initiatives have been unsuccessful and at least one of them has been viewed as helping The District to do a better job of innovating. A stable and cohesive, but not isolated, district culture also contributed to its capacity for change. New funding was now available for financing some change or changes of significant magnitude.

Chapter 6

FINDINGS: SELECTION OF LIBRARIES AS A FOCUS FOR CHANGE

The selection of libraries as a focus for change was the second major theme that emerged from the analysis of the case study data base. As has been shown in the previous chapter, The District had a high capacity for innovation. This chapter explores the reasons for the selection of libraries, rather than another area such as new technologies, for example, as a focus for planned change.

In the late eighties, the Sherwood Park Catholic School District was ready to begin some improvement projects. Access to new funding came at a time when the financial difficulties of The District had been addressed, there were areas of perceived need, and The District's problem-solving orientation meant that some or all these needs would likely be addressed in a purposeful manner. The District's libraries were only one area of perceived need. Others included the elementary science program, consulting services, new technologies, and school buildings. In addition, there were new curricula to implement at nearly every grade level. The selection of libraries and of the cooperative integrated school library program model as the focus for a major planned change project was neither automatic nor serendipitous.

The adoption of a provincial school library policy and the development of a school library program model for Alberta had brought more attention to school libraries throughout the province. However, although many school districts in Alberta recognized the need to improve their libraries when the policy and program model were disseminated by Alberta Education, only a few have been

able to take the steps necessary to initiate these changes, that is, to make the decision to adopt a cooperative integrated school library program model.

A number of factors help to explain why Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District was one of those very few: a) there was a perceived need in the area addressed by the innovation; b) the innovation was well developed and clearly defined; c) the innovation had been supported by provincial policy; d) there was an awareness of the innovation in The District; and e) there were advocates for the innovation within and outside The District.

Perceived Need

The pressures for change in The District's libraries had been there for a long time and the pressures had been gradually building. Not all members of the community were expecting change in the libraries of The District; indeed, some had become quite accepting of the deficiencies in their libraries and seemed to believe there was no possibility of improvement. However, the need for improvement was recognized by many in The District.

The principals' annual budget requests often included funding requests for their libraries. This was noted by the Superintendent, by the trustees, and by principals in the course of interviews with them. Although teachers as a group were not specifically cited as supporting change in libraries, their concerns were reflected in the principals' wish lists which were generally developed with much teacher involvement. Although some principals and teachers had become quite despairing of library improvements, the school library program evaluation process raised their expectations for change and increased the pressure for change.

Development of the Innovation

The innovation, that is, the cooperative integrated school library program, had been developing and being defined over a long period of time. The first use in Canada of the term, cooperative planning and teaching, dates from the late 1970s. It first appeared in an official ministry of education document in 1982. This document, Partners in Action, developed by the Ontario Ministry of Education, recommended that teachers and teacher-librarians work together to develop resource-based units of instruction. In other provinces, school library program models were developed at the district level. In Alberta, the Calgary Board of Education was the leader in the development of school library program models and many aspects of the Calgary model are evident in the Alberta Education model, Focus on Learning.

The literature of school librarianship in Canada includes numerous articles related to the cooperative integrated school library program model and its implementation. There have also been many workshops, conference sessions, and other inservice activities presented in Alberta related to this program model. The innovation, the cooperative integrated school library program, had been clearly defined in Canada both within the field of school librarianship and by provincial and district level documents through the 1980s.

Provincial Policy Supporting the Innovation

The policy supporting and defining the role of the school library in Alberta schools was approved by the then Minister of Education, David King, in 1984. The need for the policy had been brought to the attention of the Government of Alberta through extensive lobbying activities by the Learning Resources Council of the Alberta Teachers' Association and by the Library Association of Alberta. In addition to meetings with the Minister of Education, presentations

to the Social Services Caucus, and letter-writing campaigns, there was a School Libraries Symposium sponsored by the Alberta Teachers' Association. This symposium gave a wide range of stakeholders the opportunity to respond to the Position Paper on School Libraries (1983) developed by a departmental committee of Alberta Education.

Shortly after the approval of the School Library Policy, a committee was set up by Alberta Education to develop an implementation document to assist schools and school districts to meet the expectations of the policy. With the publication in 1985 of Focus on Learning, the cooperative integrated school library program model had been formally adopted by Alberta Education for Alberta schools. The following year an inservice package was developed by Alberta Education to give schools and school districts further assistance in assessing their school library programs and planning the improvement of those programs (Alberta Education, 1986).

Awareness of the Innovation

The development of the School Library Policy by Alberta Education had contributed to The District's awareness of the need for change. The policy and implementation document, Focus on Learning, was distributed by Alberta Education to every district office and school in the province. The District was involved in the Focus on Learning Awareness Seminars, on the invitation of Alberta Education. These workshops were used by Alberta Education to disseminate information to school districts. This approach, often referred to as the Cascade model, involves inservicing district representatives in order that they might inservice the other people in their districts.

Some educators in the Sherwood Park Catholic Separate District were aware of the Focus on Learning document with its cooperative integrated

school library program model from the time of its publication in 1985; at least three principals and several teachers from The District had been to the Awareness Seminars sponsored by Alberta Education to familiarize district leadership staff with the model.

> That year the Focus on Learning inservicing was done province wide and I still recall the inservice that was conducted by the lead teacher that we sent. It was approximately thirty minutes long and it was basically, 'This is what I was told that I think has any use, I'll tell it to you, here it is.' From there on, nothing more was done. . . . I don't know whether in any other schools it went any better. But the Cascade model didn't work well because there was no followup. (Director, Interview)

The following school year, the Focus on Learning model continued to be discussed but no action was taken in relation to the program at the district level. "The Library Integrated Program is still on hold as is the new Health Program for the junior high" (Minutes, Administrators Meeting, November 12, 1986). However, the Learning Resources Grant provided by Alberta Education for the upgrading of library collections was accessed for each school in The District.

The District was also aware of the cooperative integrated school library program model because of the close proximity of the schools in The District to schools of the County of Strathcona Board of Education. The District felt itself to be in competition with County schools and the County does have a centrally coordinated, well-funded school library program delivered, in most schools, by teacher-librarians. The County's school library program was evaluated by Alberta Education in 1987.

The District had access to information about the innovation and some individuals in The District were relatively knowledgeable about the existence of the innovation. Only a very few individuals understood, however, that the

innovation, as presented in Focus in Learning, was an instructional program that would have to be developed and implemented by teachers.

Advocacy for the Innovation

The Superintendent clearly had seen the deficiencies in the libraries of The District from the time he joined The District as Assistant Superintendent and, because of his own views of the crucial role of libraries in children's education, he supported the need for change. The Director, Curriculum and Instruction from his experience as a community school coordinator and as a parent with children in District schools, also saw the need for change.

The Board of Trustees had become aware of the inadequacies of the libraries through the budget process. At the time of the decision, the Board of Trustees had an unusually high proportion of educators (four out of seven were employed in education) and two in particular were strong advocates of reading and libraries. These trustees all had children in the system, currently or in the past, and, through their children's experiences, had gained another kind of awareness about The District's libraries.

The possible impact of the high proportion of educators on the Board of Trustees is a moot point. The trustees themselves did not agree on the nature of that impact:

> I hesitate to say it but I think that the composition of the Board, the number of educators on that Board, was part of the focus on libraries. I'm very keen on them myself, and that would have an impact. . . . I've always seen libraries as very important in schools. I've had the experience throughout my career of libraries that were inadequate. It's that simple. I don't think I've had the experience of a school, either as a teacher or as a trustee, where I felt the library was up to snuff. (Trustee, Interview)

> The educators on the board did not really have a big impact on the library decision. If anything, I think we may have gone further on technology without educators on the board. (Trustee, Interview)

One incident, early in the Spring of 1988, appears to have been significant in galvanizing and heightening the awareness and commitment of the trustees in relation to the improvement of the libraries in The District. This incident occurred in the course of visits to the schools by the Facilities Committee and the Superintendent, during the first year of the Board's 1987-1990 term. Several trustees commented on the impact of that visit as did the principal of the high school. Here is one trustee's recollection of that visit:

> I guess when I put the push on for libraries first was when I was on the Facilities Committee. We went around to all of the schools and we looked at everything from baseboards to lightbulbs and leaks. In one school we went into, I asked to see the library and I was advised by the principal that it was locked at the moment. Well, I wanted to see the library and eventually a key was found and I was brought into the library. I was appalled, absolutely appalled, at the state of that library. . . . I came out of that school with one goal in mind, that if we ever had any money at all we would put some money into libraries. . . . We always discussed things in committee and that was the start of saying even if it's only $5000 a year or $10,000 a year. . . . I was advised that different schools had submitted budgets for various things each year. . . . In this particular school there was not a push to put money into libraries and the idea was, 'Well, the children can use public libraries. They can use libraries elsewhere and this was a duplication of services.' It was a very angry meeting and I was quite volatile. I must say the majority of the trustees, probably five out of seven, were with me. They felt that libraries were an integral part. Now we didn't know how much money we would have, we didn't know if we'd ever get any money, but at least it was going to be one of the goals. (Trustee, Interview)

In addition to the advocates within The District, there were advocates from outside The District who had been invited into The District. These were members of the school library program evaluation team. The District has often looked to individuals within the system for innovative solutions but, in this case, there was not sufficient expertise within the system to direct the change.

The external members of the evaluation team, through their work at both the school and district level, explained the rationale behind the innovation and pointed to ways in which The District could incorporate the innovation into The District.

This was not the first time that evaluators from outside The District had expressed their concerns about libraries. In the 1987 Alberta Education evaluation report on the Ukrainian bilingual program, the evaluators noted that library resources need to be developed, specifically professional periodicals, audiovisual materials, and both fiction and nonfiction print materials for student use. The expertise of external evaluators in several instances had contributed to the awareness of the need for change and provided both support and direction for the change.

It is important to note, however, that the evaluators who served on the school libraries program evaluation team were not directly involved in the selection for adoption of the cooperative school library program model. They were working in The District at the request of the Superintendent and the Board of Trustees. It was the Superintendent and the Board of Trustees who had the decision-making responsibility for the selection for adoption of this innovation.

Selection of Other Innovations for Adoption

School libraries was only one of the areas selected for attention by The District at the time of the adoption of the cooperative integrated school library program. The District also put its energies into improving the elementary science program, developing a Curriculum Resources Bank for consulting services, planning a major renovation of its high school facility, and implementing several new curricula. These initiatives came in response to

widely agreed upon needs in the case of the first three, and in response to mandates of Alberta Education in the case of curriculum changes.

In contrast, The District has not yet adopted a plan for new technologies. Although it has been an area of perceived need for some time by some people within The District, no concerted effort has yet been directed toward changes in this area. This lack of adoption of a plan to incorporate new technologies can be explained in terms of many of the same factors that explained the adoption of the cooperative integrated school library program model. There is not general agreement as to the need for change, there is no clearly defined program model, and at present the advocacy within The District is limited to a small group, most of whom are neither serving in District Office nor on the Board of Trustees.

The District's capacity for change means that innovations are frequently adopted and implemented in The District. The District is required by Alberta Education to adopt and implement curriculum changes. Other changes are determined by The District. Which innovations are selected can be understood in terms of the extent to which a need or problem is perceived within The District, the availability of an innovation that could address the need or problem, and the influence or power of those who advocate the innovation. These factors help to explain why the cooperative integrated school library program, like the improvements to the elementary science program, the Curriculum Resources Bank, and the high school renovation, was selected for adoption by The District.

Chapter Summary

The decision by Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District to adopt the cooperative integrated school library program appears to have been influenced by the existence of and the awareness within The District of the innovation and by advocacy of this innovation from within and beyond The District. The need to improve libraries had been apparent for a long time but it was only one of a number of areas within The District that was seen to be in need of improvement. Those areas selected for attention by The District were those where there was a strongly and widely perceived need, where there was a clear pattern available for guiding action, and where the Superintendent and Board of Trustees supported the changes.

Chapter 7

FINDINGS: KEY ROLES IN THE ADOPTION PROCESS

Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District had a high capacity for innovation and it had selected libraries as a focus for change. The third major theme that emerged from the analysis of the case study data base centred on the people who played key roles in the adoption process.

Shared Responsibilities

The decision to improve the District's libraries developed over an extensive period of time and through the actions of a great many people. Perhaps this accounts for some of the commitment that was evident in the process. As the Superintendent commented, "if you can establish ownership at all levels, then it [the change] has the greatest chance of success" (Superintendent, Interview). However, some individuals did have more active roles in the adoption process itself. The key people involved in the decision included: the principals and teachers; the Board of Trustees; the Superintendent; the Director, Curriculum and Instruction; and the external evaluators. The students and their parents did not appear to have played key roles in the adoption process.

Role of Students and Parents

The role of the students and parents in the change appears to have been minimal. However, since no students or parents were interviewed for this study, their role is seen here only through the eyes of others.

It appears that parents were aware of the need for improvement in The District's libraries but when their concern was made known to school officials, it was generally expressed more in terms of the need for more technology or better facilities or collections, rather than for an instructional program (Principal, Interview). The students in the high school were aware of the importance of knowing how to use libraries effectively. When interviewed by a member of the evaluation team, a number of students acknowledged that they lacked these skills and revealed they were preparing to get help to learn those skills for their post-secondary education from family members or from the library staff of the university or college where they intended to enroll (Evaluator, Interview).

The dissatisfaction of some parents and students in relation to the school libraries in The District may have influenced some of the key decision makers. In addition, trustees, as parents and community members, were aware of the need for improvement in The District's libraries. One commented, "My own children had always complained about the library" (Trustee, Interview).

Role of Principals and Teachers

The principals and teachers of The District were receptive to the idea of library improvement and they were looking to The District for help and support. One of the ways that the school staffs expressed their concerns was through the budgeting process, that is, through the priority lists or "wish lists" that they developed for District Office and the Board of Trustees.

> The schools themselves had sent forward wish lists for libraries and, in fact, one of the smaller schools had sent forward quite a strong wish list. That particular school was putting an effort into

> it, not only requesting money for resources in the library but actually wanting to design the library area. (Trustee, Interview)

Several principals had developed an understanding of the Focus on Learning model and had taken some first steps in implementing the model. Some had attended Alberta Education workshops. One of the principals who had attended an Alberta Education Awareness Seminar in 1986 set up a library committee in his school, beginning with himself and two interested teachers, to look at ways to integrate the library into classroom programs. The staff eventually developed a number of library-based units of study. The principal informally shared the work that he and his staff were doing to improve library utilization with other principals at The District's Administrators Meeting (Principal, Interview). This particular principal had used library resources extensively in his own teaching, first as a student teacher and later in developing programs for low-achieving junior high students.

Involvement by principals in the selection of school libraries as an area for improvement was confirmed by the Superintendent in his discussion of factors that helped to make possible the improvement of The District's libraries:

> There was one principal who did really have a good grasp on the Alberta Education handbook, Focus on Learning, had gone to one of those Alberta Education inservice sessions. . . . in another school the principal was quite enthusiastic. He wanted to do certain things and he was badgering me, really, for more funds. (Superintendent, Interview)

Teachers were involved in the budget planning process of The District through their involvement in developing their schools' annual budget requests. Several of the principals interviewed stated that teachers regularly included libraries as one of their suggestions for budget requests and that these budget requests, called "wish lists" by the Superintendent and others in The District,

were the main means by which the schools brought their library needs to the attention of the Superintendent.

Some teachers in The District were also aware of Focus on Learning and the cooperative integrated school library program model through their participation in an Alberta Education Awareness Seminar and their role as lead teachers in conveying information about the Alberta Education policy and program model to the other staff in their schools.

Role of Trustees

Various trustees had been concerned about the state of the district's libraries for a long time, from their own observations and from the schools' annual budget priority lists.

> Right from the beginning, because libraries are an interest of mine, I looked at the libraries, talked to people, observed what was happening in the schools my own kids were in. I saw that the libraries just weren't up to scratch, particularly at the high school. (Trustee, Interview)

> [The change] was not primarily a trustee thrust. The thrust had been there and had been put forward over a couple of years. I remember clearly saying to the Superintendent we have to do something about libraries but it would be unfair to say that the trustees initiated it. (Trustee, Interview)

The role of the trustees was to affirm the importance of the change. This they did by including library improvement in the district goals and priorities, by allocating funds for library improvement, by approving the school library program evaluation, and by directing the administration to follow through on the School Library Program Evaluation Report recommendations.

Role of the Superintendent

The Superintendent had an essential communication role between the schools and the Board of Trustees. His actions in relation to the improvement of libraries signalled to the schools that the change was important.

Some aspects of the Superintendent's education and experience may be significant. He spent the first five years of his teaching career in New Brunswick, working at the secondary level in physical education and mathematics.

> I then went to the Northwest Territories for 21 years and, interestingly enough, one of my assignments was halftime school librarian. I had no specific library training other than the library science course that we took at teacher's college. Everybody had to take it. I then was a principal of an elementary school, K to six, and that's where I really began to recognize the value of the library as a learning resource for children and as a support for teachers as well in teaching children. I then went out to the University of Victoria Child Learning Centre for two summers and took courses on teaching styles and learning styles, to try to match those up. I guess that would have been around 1972, 1973. From that time on I guess I've been an advocate of the development of---I don't like to call them libraries, I like to call them learning resource centres because I think they're more than libraries in the traditional sense. Then I became a superintendent in the North and one of my thrusts was to try to get a lot of learning resources in our resource centres in the native children's languages so that the materials were more meaningful to them. . . . When I came to this District, I was working with teachers on teacher evaluations. I think if an evaluation is worth anything, you're supposed to be giving teachers new ideas to improve instruction. And so you start looking for things in the school that they might consider to help improve instruction. I guess because of my background and sensitivity and the work I had done in the North trying to develop school resource centres, that was one of the things I was looking for. (Superintendent, Interview)

The Superintendent brought to The District his concept of the school library as an important resource for teaching and learning. As Superintendent, he began to focus the attention on deficiencies in The District's libraries in a

variety of ways. He brought the problem to the attention of the Board of Trustees.

> I think the Superintendent's role was very strong. I think he took, from my point of view, a leadership role in the improvement of libraries. He recognized the need and he certainly was supportive. . . . he pushed for it and brought it to the Board of Trustees. . . . I think he's been talking about it since he's been the Superintendent. (Interview, Trustee)

The Superintendent also provided direction to the Board of Trustees in relation to ways of addressing the problem.

> When we heard that we could get some money for libraries, it was the Superintendent's suggestion that, rather than every school going out and buying their books and dumping them on the shelves, we have an analysis done of our libraries and see how we could improve them. . . . I must give the Superintendent credit for that. It would have been so much easier to do your own thing. . . . Of course, it would have been a disastrous mistake. It would have been spreading the ignorance rather than having something better, based on good theory, common sense, the knowledge of people in the field. . . . It's not easy to say we just don't have the expertise here. . . . We asked Alberta Education to do an evaluation of the libraries for us and they did. (Interview, Trustee)

The Superintendent discussed the need to improve libraries with the principals and signalled to them that he was serious about dealing with the problem:

> At the principals' meeting, when the evaluation was finished, when we knew money was going to be made available, they [the Superintendent and the Director] said to all the principals, 'We're going to release this money we've set aside.' I think it was $125,000 for the system. 'But, before we release any money to you, you're going to have to give us a [library] policy.' It was a good approach. Money is so hard to get that you don't want to spend it foolishly. . . . so I didn't disagree with the policy at all or the method they were using. It forced me to get down and learn more about libraries. . . . We were to involve, of course, our staff in developing the policy and I did. (Interview, Principal)

The Superintendent had a clear understanding of the reasons for the Alberta Education school library program evaluation and he guided the

evaluation process. He met with the Consultant from the Edmonton Regional Office of Alberta Education to establish the terms of reference for the evaluation:

> One of the first things the Superintendent told me right up front was that 'We want this to be meaningful but it has to be recommendations that can be within our means. We've got some money but don't come out here and think you're going to solve it all by recommending teacher-librarians for the whole district.' He was very upfront about what their limitations were and what expectations The District had about the whole process. In the very first meeting he told me that. Basically he gave the terms of reference right off the top of his head, and then I presented him with the model for school libraries, which he was familiar with. But we looked at it and I said, 'Let's make sure that the terms of reference cover the whole model and that we will be looking at the total library program.' I guess I brought that to his attention to make sure that he understood that I was going to be looking at instruction as well as management and development. But he realized that he was doing it for instruction . . . as a bottom line he knew why he was doing this. It was for the good of his students, for instruction. (Evaluator, Interview)

When the first draft of the School Library Program Evaluation Report was discussed with the Superintendent, he gave the evaluation team encouragement to strengthen the nature of their recommendations:

> In discussing it, we had decided that what was needed was a district librarian. That was something that we as an evaluation committee didn't think we could get. But on that Friday afternoon when we gathered again, we mentioned it to the Superintendent and he said 'Give it a shot, see what happens.' (Director, Interview)

The Superintendent guided the first steps in the improvement of The District's libraries. Some planning had been done at District Office, initiated by him, before the evaluation took place. Immediately after the School Library Program Evaluation Report had been presented to the Board of Trustees, the Superintendent developed a plan for putting those recommendations into

practice. "He wrote it up on the weekend. I came in on Monday morning and it was on my desk" (Director, Interview).

Although in one interview the Superintendent described his role as "just initiating the thing," his involvement in the adoption of a library program for The District was in fact much more extensive.

Role of the Director, Curriculum and Instruction

The Director played an important role in the adoption process. In addition to his role as district coordinator in the area of curriculum and instruction, his role as a member of the school libraries program evaluation team gave him a unique opportunity to work as a linking agent and as a conduit into The District for new ideas related to school libraries.

The educational background and experience of the Director may be of importance in understanding something of his role. He began his career teaching mathematics in a large city high school. After six years, he came into The District at the time that the Jordan Plan, the modified school week, was already in place at the high school. The Director became the coordinator for the Jordan Plan. The demise of the plan two years later left him with an awareness of the difficulty of introducing educational change and with an interest in community education. He completed a Master's degree in community education and then took the position of assistant principal and community school curriculum coordinator at The District's designated community school, a K to nine school. He and another staff member were assigned the task of developing the community school concept.

> My job basically was to work with the teachers at developing sound field trip and guest speaker kinds of experiences. We used the phrase that what we were doing was 'bringing the school into the community and the community into the school'. . . . It was an

> attempt to make the community part of the classroom but in a structured and meaningful way. We developed over the years a number of units. I tracked things down and made all the arrangements as well as sitting down with the teacher and doing the curricular planning, much like a librarian would do in a situation where there's a teacher-librarian, using the resources of the library. I was trying to do the same kinds of thing but using the resources of the community. . . . one of the years I was there, in order to make the timetable fit, I became supervisor of library periods for some of the language arts teachers so I began to see the operation of the school library from the inside, but I still didn't have a true knowledge of how a school library should run in conjunction with the staff. (Director, Interview)

In 1987, he left the position of assistant principal at the community school to assume an eight month position at the district level as Director, Curriculum and Instruction. He shared curriculum responsibilities for The District with one other person, the religious studies consultant. During the first few months in the position, the planning began for an evaluation of The District's libraries. The Director was given the major responsibility for working with the evaluation team. During the planning, at the Director's initiative and request, his role was expanded to membership on the evaluation team:

> The Director was fairly new in his position. He was the one that I was to work with to make the decisions about how this evaluation was to take place. . . . As I worked with him, I gained respect for his abilities. When he asked to be on the team, I felt that it was a good decision. As I recall, he asked if I thought he would be a hindrance or whether he would be able to contribute something to the team. I was beginning to see that if anything was going to happen in this district, somebody would need to have a real commitment to the recommendations and, as it turned out, that's exactly what happened. He was very open. When I first met him, I talked about Focus on Learning and the next day he phoned me and asked for ten copies. By the time I saw him the next time I knew that he'd not only read it once, he'd read it several times. He'd made sure that every school in The District had it and understood that it was to be the basis for the evaluation. So he was very open to learning. . . . That was probably his strength. [During the evaluation] sometimes he took some abuse from the schools. We three would come to the school and the principal or whoever met us would look around and say 'I thought there were going to be three of you.' He was the invisible member there! He had had nothing to do with

> libraries; he was a math teacher so . . . he didn't have the image in The District as being a large supporter of libraries. However, we assured them that he was indeed a part of the team and that he was an important part of the team. In the beginning he was not very secure in terms of his role on the team. Then, as he gained confidence, and certainly by the time we were making recommendations, he was a very, very important member of the team. I think the success of the implementation [of the recommendations] is to his credit because he'd seen all the libraries, he had seen what we were trying to accomplish. Each day he talked about what he'd learned and he's put that into practice. (Evaluator, Interview)

Role of the External Evaluators

Two of the external evaluators were involved in the evaluation of all of The District's libraries including the Learning Resource Centre at District Office. The third external evaluator was included because of her expertise in French language materials; she was involved in the evaluation of that aspect of the collection and program of the library of the one French Immersion school in The District. For this study, the role of the third external evaluator will not be addressed because her involvement in the evaluation, though important, was brief and she worked independently of the evaluation team.

The Alberta Education consultant was, at the time of the evaluation, in her second year with the department. She had worked previously for the Grande Prairie Public School District as a classroom teacher, a school-based teacher-librarian, and a district computer consultant. She has an M. Ed. in educational administration and has served on regional and provincial Executive Councils of the Learning Resources Council, a Specialist Council of the Alberta Teachers' Association.

The consultant from the Edmonton Catholic School District was, at the time of the evaluation, in her seventh year in that position. She had previously served in the district as a classroom teacher, an assistant principal, and a

language arts facilitator. She has an M. Ed. in educational technology and has served as a practicum associate at the University of Alberta. She also has served on a regional Executive Council of the Learning Resources Council.

These two external evaluators, through their involvement with all of the schools and with District Office staff, played an important role in the process that led to the adoption of the cooperative integrated school library program model by The District. They brought to their work in The District a deep understanding of Alberta Education's school library policy and program model. Both had been involved in bringing the policy and program model into being, through lobbying activities and through the development of the program model and of the inservice package for the program model. Both of the external evaluators had given numerous workshops for teachers and administrators on Focus on Learning. Both also had considerable experience with the evaluation of school library programs.

The external evaluators helped give the schools and District Office personnel a clearer understanding of the instructional role of the school library. They engaged in extensive discussions with teachers and administrators at each school during the evaluation process. The discussions after each school visit by the evaluation team gave the evaluators the opportunity to share with the Director their understanding of Alberta Education's school library policy and program model in a meaningful context. The Director's comments confirm how powerful a learning experience the evaluation process was for him.

The involvement of the external evaluators did not end with the preparation of the program evaluation report. The Alberta Education consultant, along with the Associate Director of the Edmonton Regional Office of Alberta Education, presented the final report of the evaluation to the Board of Trustees. The Superintendent stated that the consultant was "extremely

successful in impressing on our Board the seriousness of the situation" (Superintendent, Interview). At the request of the principal of the high school, the consultant from Edmonton Catholic School District came out after the evaluation to talk to the high school department heads about the cooperative integrated library program. The external evaluators continued, in the months that followed the completion of the school library program evaluation, to provide assistance in a wide variety of ways including providing sample school library policies, suggesting possible candidates for the position of District Librarian, participating in followup visits to all the schools a year after the evaluation, and preparing and presenting a followup report to the Board of Trustees.

Interrelationships Among the Key Roles

The key to the success of the adoption process lies in the strong interrelationships among those people who were in the position to affect the decision-making process. There is evidence that the key decision-makers worked together throughout the adoption process. For example, the Director worked closely with the Superintendent. They both worked with the principals. The Superintendent worked closely with the Board of Trustees.

> Once the staff saw that senior administration was committed, then everybody was marching to the same tune. . . . Of course, the Board passes policy and puts the money in place but in the day-to-day working it's the senior administration that really carries it. . . . those of us who sit on the Board realize that we have financial and moral persuasion but we really need people to carry out that policy. . . . It also helps when we as trustees go to the community and say, 'Yes, this is what we're doing and this is why we're doing it.' Then the principals feel confident. (Trustee, Interview)

> The principals were aware that there was a need [to improve libraries] . . . but I suppose we'd become accepting of it. . . . You

> get lulled into accepting it rather than looking for change. Then if someone else notices it, particularly a trustee who says, 'Look it, we've got to do something about our libraries', well, it confirms what you already know. . . . We were ready for change. We recognized that we needed to change. Then, when the money came and the personnel came, there was nothing stopping us because the will was already there. Once we got the resources, it just happened. Everybody just dove in. . . . First of all, The District had to have a policy and each of the schools had to have a library policy. That required a bit of work. . . . We got out and asked questions . . . and the ladies on the evaluation team gave me a lot of ideas. And I was working with [the Director] because he was working on the district policy as I was working on the one for the school. (Interview, Principal)

Among the key decision makers throughout The District, there seemed to be a belief in the importance of working together. The interrelationships among the principals, the Superintendent, the Director, and the Board of Trustees were characterized by the same attributes as those of the board-superintendent relationship in the school districts with a productive district ethos in the LaRocque and Coleman study: "There was no sense of one dominating the other or encroaching on the other's domain, but rather of the two working in a complementary fashion towards shared goals" (1989, p. 26). In the efforts to improve the libraries in Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District, there was a sense of the many working in a complementary fashion towards shared goals.

Chapter Summary

The most influential decision makers in the selection of the innovation to be adopted were the Superintendent and the Board of Trustees. The Superintendent had a deep commitment to improving libraries which he shared with the Board. The resolve of the Board had been focussed and solidified by the visit of the Facilities Committee to the high school's library. The pressure for improving The District's libraries that came from the principals and from the

evaluators could have been resisted without the shared commitment of the Superintendent and the Board. The Director, Curriculum and Instruction, contributed to the selection of libraries as an area for improvement through his work in making schools aware of the Focus on Learning model. Although the parents and the students had little direct impact on The District's decision to select an innovation that centred on libraries, their dissatisfaction may have influenced those who had a stronger and more direct role in the selection process.

Chapter 8

FINDINGS: UNDERSTANDING OF THE INNOVATION

The fourth major theme that emerged from the analysis of the case study data base was that the adoption process involved a change in the understanding of the innovation within The District. The District had a high capacity for innovation; it had selected libraries as a focus for change; and key decision makers were involved in adopting the innovation within The District.

However, the key advocates within the District for the improvement of The District's libraries did not initially define the improvement in terms of an instructional program, directed by teachers and integrated with the overall instructional program. Their major concern was an improvement in library collections, primarily an improvement in the quality and quantity of books on the shelves. Their involvement in the adoption process changed their understanding of what the improvement of libraries involved.

Development of New Understandings

Cuban (1988) discusses the nature of planned change in terms of first-order and second-order changes. First-order changes are improvements in the efficiency and effectiveness of what currently in place without changing goals or roles; second-order changes alter fundamental goals or roles. Price and Romberg (1981) use the terms ameliorative and radical in their consideration of these differences in the depth and difficulty of planned change.

The improvement of The District's libraries was initially understood in terms of a first-order or ameliorative change; by the end of the 1988-1989 school year, the improvement of The District's libraries was beginning to be

defined as a second-order or radical change. The innovation, for the high school in particular, was beginning to be understood not as more and better resources but as an instructional program designed to help students use those resources in order to develop as independent learners. New understandings had also developed in relation to who should direct the library program and how it should fit into the teaching and learning practices of the school.

The Role of the School Library

The role of the library in the school was one of five issues that were discussed during the development of a school library policy for Alberta. The position paper developed by a departmental committee of Alberta Education expressed this issue in the question: "What should be the role of the school library in the overall instructional program of the school?" Three alternatives were outlined for this issue:

1. The primary role of the school library should be to provide those services, facilities, and materials that will promote: intellectual curiosity and a desire for lifelong learning; a love of literature, books, and leisure reading; and the opportunity to use a variety of information sources to pursue individual needs and interests.

2. The primary role of the school library should be to provide services, facilities, and materials that are fully integrated with the instructional program of the school. A fully integrated role implies: that the library media collection is selected specifically to meet curriculum requirements; that the services provided are those designed to facilitate curriculum implementation; and that the teachers and library staff work in close partnership to share responsibility for student achievement of curriculum goals and objectives.

3. The role of the school library should be to attend to both 1 and 2 above. (Alberta Education, 1983)

The Alberta school library policy reflects the second conception of the appropriate role for the library, and Focus on Learning, the support document prepared to assist schools and school districts in implementing the policy,

recommends the cooperative integrated school library program model as a means by which that role can be realized. The Alberta School Library Policy defines the purpose of the library and the place of the library in schooling; by that definition, it also indicates who must be responsible for direction of the library.

The Purpose of the School Library

The Library as Collection and Facility

Initially, improvement of The District's libraries was defined by the participants as a change in collections and facilities:

> The focus on the library, for me, was improving collections. (Trustee, Interview)

> I think from the District's perspective, what most people were concerned about was that there were poor collections. . . . Their main goal was to increase those collections to what would be an acceptable standard. At the high school in particular . . . parents were concerned that it was on the whole a pretty poor collection. (Principal, Interview)

The improvements to be made would be improvements in facilities and collections, and generally these were conceptualized in terms of the physical items that money could buy. One informant asked, "Will $10,000 per school or $5 or $10 per student . . . bring about any improvement?" (Former Associate Superintendent, Interview). The expectations and concerns of trustees and principals related to the library evaluation were primarily concerns related to facilities and collections. The library was generally defined in terms of collections of print materials, of space to be utilized, and of access to and control of print materials.

> It's been evident ever since I've been here that our library was lacking. . . . There was a lack of titles to begin with, space not being utilized properly, even access to materials and control of materials. (Principal, Interview)

In anticipating the evaluation, people at the district and school level were not sure what was "wrong" but several informants stated that they had expected that it would be related to not enough money for collections and not enough direction in selection of materials.

For many years, the high school library had been used as a study hall and a recreational reading area.

> When I first came, the library was used more as a place where kids could do their work, like a study hall. We only had about $3500 a year so what we would do is we'd buy paperbacks. We didn't have enough money to buy books to support the curriculum. . . . So we would buy paperbacks for free reading because we still wanted to encourage kids to read. (Principal, Interview)

In the other schools in the district, which serve elementary and junior high students, book exchange and some fiction-based library programming was being provided by the library clerks, usually during scheduled weekly library periods. Overall, before the program evaluation, school libraries were being understood in terms of collections and facilities developed to promote students' reading. This is evident in the nature of the library collections in The District. Every school had 50% or more of its collection devoted to fiction materials (School Library Program Evaluation Report, 1988, p. 7).

The Library as Instructional Program

The interviews for this study began in May of 1990, about 18 months after the school library program evaluation. Those interviews provided evidence that District Office staff, some members of the Board of Trustees, and some principals viewed the school library in terms of an instructional program. For

the majority of those interviewed, this was a change in their understanding of the purpose of the school library.

That does not mean that those interviewed had the same view of the nature of the instructional program that would be developed using the library collections and facilities. Some expressed concerns that, at the elementary level, in emphasizing the teaching of the research process there might be a diminished emphasis on the importance of developing the skills for and the enjoyment of reading. Others were concerned about the need for providing electronic media for student access to information and about the impact that might have on students' learning. However, these concerns reflect an understanding of the school library program as an instructional program developed to enhance students' ability to use information.

Place of the Library Program in Schooling

Isolated from Teaching and Learning

The library program was not seen initially as an integral part of teaching and learning. For example, the high school teachers generally saw library research as something students did by themselves to create a product; they considered that their job as teachers was to evaluate the product, not to teach students how to create that product.

Soon after the release of the School Library Program Evaluation Report, the principal of the high school arranged for one of the evaluators to talk to him and his department heads about the role of teachers in the program:

> The principal asked me back to talk about what is the intent of a school library as described in Focus on Learning. They did not understand cooperative planning and teaching, they did not understand integrated programming, they did not understand the

> library as integral to the program. . . . When I talked about it, it was like describing a brave new world. (Evaluator, Interview)

Throughout The District, there had been little integration of the school library with classroom programs and activities (School Library Program Evaluation Report, 1988, p. 4). In most instances, teachers were using their school libraries to provide student access to leisure reading materials. In only one school was there evidence of regular use of library resources to achieve curricular goals.

Integral to Teaching and Learning

By the time of the decision to hire a district librarian to work parttime as a teacher-librarian at the high school and parttime as a library consultant for The District, many of the key players had begun to see the library program as an integral part of teaching and learning. The Superintendent's initial and continuing view of the library was as "a vibrant part of the school operation", and "one of the things that help teachers improve instruction." He viewed the school library as a multimedia facility that could be used by teachers to deliver and supplement the curriculum and to excite children about learning. In his view, maximizing teacher use of libraries would improve the quality of teaching and would support the development of students' self-esteem.

For others in the school district, there had been "a radical change in library expectations" (Trustee, Inteview). Many now felt that the library must be integral to, not separate from, the school and the curriculum. The program offered through the library would be a "solid integrated curriculum program" (Director, Interview), where "planned projects" were the means by which students learned "how to use the library" (Principal, Interview).

> What kinds of [library] skills should the little guys in grade one have at the end of the year? How should that be taught through

> the language arts program, for example? That's where it should start. Tying it in with the curriculum, [developing] scope and sequence charts, working with the teachers. (Principal, Interview)

Responsibility for the Library Program

Support Personnel

The responsibility for the library program was, before the program evaluation, not usually considered to be that of the teachers. This is reflected in the first reactions at the district level to Focus on Learning.

> Alberta Education had become quite involved in the evaluation of libraries in the province and at the local level, and we had been involved in a number of workshops with our own staffs. . . . We spent a fair amount of time with people in inservice, trying to get support personnel familiar with what was involved. The big debate still rages out there as to whether the librarian should have a teacher's degree. . . . My feeling is that a good lay person with some library skills and some training should be able to deal with the library and help kids to make use of it. I felt that they could do just as good a job as a teacher. Teachers have, of course, a little plus on their side because of the fact that they know the curriculum. (Former Assistant Superintendent, Interview)

In practice, in the elementary and junior high schools, most of the programs, where they were provided, were provided by the library clerk, in isolation from the curriculum and the classroom:

> The library clerk ran an isolated program that probably the teachers should have been running. Well, definitely I now know the teachers should have been running it. (Director, Interview)

> Teachers were generally resigned to poor library service. . . . They just accepted that that's what it was and it wasn't going to change, hopeful that it might but just accepting that it probably never would. . . . They got accustomed to bringing their kids to the library and letting the librarian take over, not because they viewed that as the best thing but because they didn't know what to do there, they didn't know what their role was. . . . They were relinquishing any instructional role in the library, almost out of politeness, because it was the librarian's turf, her domain, so she determined what happened there. (Evaluator, Interview)

Teachers in the high school were generally relinquishing their instructional role as well.

> We have the County library just half a block away and the kids could walk over there. So, if a social studies class wanted to do a research project, you would say 'Let's go over to the library' and they would walk across the field to the library and do their research project. (Principal, Interview)

The role of libraries was seen by teachers in the high school as providing access to materials, not as providing instruction in the use of materials.

> I remember being at an interview when the children were grade nine or ten and asking about the library and saying there didn't seem to be much. I was told we had a first class library in the County and that that was fulfilling the needs of the students. . . . I guess I was easily swayed by that rationale. It seemed to make sense to me as a parent. I just wondered if a child wanted to find something on genetics, if he could find something. That was basically my concern. How he did the reseach I wasn't really concerned about. (Trustee, Interview)

Teaching Personnel

Gradually, the role of the teacher in the program has been more accepted in The District:

> We've made major strides in the library, remember in the absence of a teacher-librarian. We're still a few years from teachers feeling totally comfortable [with their role]. . . . everyone was using it the best way they knew how. (Pincipal, Interview)

In the high school, there was growing recognition that the program could be developed with the assistance of a teacher-librarian who would work with the classroom teachers:

> At the time [of the evaluation] I wasn't even sure what a teacher-librarian does. I'd never worked in a school where there was a teacher-librarian before so I really didn't have any idea what services they could provide. But then I was assured by the evaluators that a teacher-librarian could help our teachers and students with research. You know, I thought the librarian being there, you came in and said, 'I want such and such a book' and the

> librarian told you how to find it. But the evaluators assured me that the teacher-librarian could actually teach classes on how to do research. . . . He would actually work in cooperation with the teachers. They would work together on units. They would teach it together, or the teacher-librarian might teach it, but they would certainly plan together what would be taught when they got the classes to the library. I think this is a tremendous advantage because some of the teachers, like me, didn't have much training in library. They knew the value of it because they'd been exposed to that, but really didn't know how to go about getting kids interested and involved in that sort of thing. (Principal, Interview)

A year and a half after the program evaluation, there was a new view of the library as an instructional program delivered by teachers, with or without the assistance or involvement of a teacher-librarian.

Sources of New Understandings

Alberta Education Policy and Program Model

Within The District, there were a number of individuals at both school and district level who were familiar with Alberta Education's school library policy and program model. Some had gone to one of the Focus on Learning workshops sponsored by Alberta Education. However, most people in The District did not have a clear understanding that the school library program is an instructional program to be developed and delivered by teaching personnel. Only in one school had the teachers, working with the leadership of the principal, been able to begin to the develop the kind of program envisioned in Focus on Learning.

Although few had been able to translate their knowledge of the Alberta Education school library policy and program model into an instructional program, the awareness generated by the distribution of the document and the participation of some individuals in workshops related to the document

appeared to have made some in The District more open to the recommendations of the School Library Program Evaluation Report.

> The documents that have come out from Alberta Education, Focus on Learning and Focus on Research, have had a lot to do with what happened here, because all of a sudden we're starting to take a look at our libraries and how teachers should be using learning resources and tying them into the curriculum. (Principal, Interview)

The Evaluation Process

Much more powerful than the Alberta Education policy or the Focus on Learning document in developing an understanding of the innovation was The District's involvement in the school library program evaluation. In one interview, the Director commented that "the evaluation process itself turned around people's images of what the library was supposed to be." The evaluation process expanded teachers' expectations related to the library and challenged their views of what constituted an excellent library program.

> When the report from Alberta Education came down, there was a feeling at one of the schools that their library was a lighthouse library. The report did not reflect that. The report reflected the fact that it was very much a place where there was a lot of guardianship of the books. . . . They didn't think those people from Alberta Education knew how to analyze libraries, that their assessment was fair. One of the schools that did quite well in the evaluations was considered by its sister schools as a bit of a dump. You know, the one who comes out with the kudos is not the one people would have thought. . . . I think that it was a bit of a shock. (Trustee, Interview)

> I've worked on other evaluation teams before and this process was certainly different. . . . I would say the process we used with Sherwood Park Catholic has more value, more potential value to help in the change process. The team was small. It amazed me that we were able to cover the district like a blanket and touch so many people. Because we talked to administrators, teachers, library staff, and students, there must have been a lot of buzz when we left. People were talking from one school to the other. Teachers would get together and say, 'Hey, were the evaluators at

> your school? What did they ask you?' Obviously it got a lot of talk going, so by the the time The District decided to act on the recommendations, the ground had already been laid. There had been enough talk already that people anticipated changes. . . . And for reasons I can't understand, people weren't threatened by us being there. . . . I think people were receptive. . . . I've been in other evaluations and people were more at arm's length. This was more homey. We just sat around the table and talked about the library. . . . I did sense some threat at the high school but they asked us to come back to have a discussion with the department heads. (Evaluator, Interview)

On her return to the high school after the evaluation, one Evaluator observed a marked change in response from teachers about the library:

> They were interested in dialoguing. I didn't sense that when I first came to the the school for the evaluation. Then it was 'These people are going to come in, they are going to look at our library and then they're going to go away and leave us alone.' That's the feeling I first got, so it was a major change in thinking. . . . Something had changed their thinking. (Evaluator, Interview)

For the Director, the team approach of the evaluation process provided a powerful mechanism for facilitating a deeper understanding of the role of the school library. At each school, each team member was responsible for a different aspect of the data collection work. At the end of the visit the team met to discuss their findings.

> It was like the [blind men] looking at the elephant. Somebody might be only looking at the ears and somebody else the tail. . . . So we actually had to sit down and talk about this library and how it's functioning in the school. As the pieces were put together, I think [the Director] became more and more aware of the far-reaching effect the library has on a school program . . . how the library is a very strong statement as to the nature of the teaching and learning that goes on in the school. I remember him being visibly enlightened. He commented constantly. . . . He was making connections and putting things together. (Evaluator, Interview)

> I really learned a lot about libraries from working with the Evaluators prior to, during, and following the evaluation. That's when I really learned what libraries are supposed to do. I got hold of Focus on Learning, read it thoroughly, and began to put it

> together. I talked informally with the Evaluators too during the evaluation. I guess my understanding of libraries is a recent understanding. (Director, Interview)

The evaluation process also shaped the nature of the recommendations made to the Board of Trustees. The Superintendent had originally warned the evaluation team that staffing The District's libraries with teacher-librarians was out of the question. However, when the team reviewed their recommendations with him and expressed their desire to recommend the establishment of a district librarian position, he gave them support and encouragement for that recommendation.

Chapter Summary

Through the adoption process, there was a major shift in understandings related to three major aspects of the school library. Initially, the key decision makers in the adoption process viewed the library as a collection and a facility, isolated from the curriculum, and operating under the responsibility of support staff. Their conceptualizations of the library through the adoption process shifted to viewing the library in terms of an instructional program, integral to the curriculum, and directed by teaching staff. The shift in understanding, though grounded in the Alberta Education school library policy and program model, occurred primarily through the evaluation process which helped to change people's understandings of the policy and program model and which helped translate their understandings into a policy and program model appropriate to the local context.

Chapter 9

PROPOSITIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND QUESTIONS

Summary of the Case Study

This case study has explored the adoption of an educational innovation, the cooperative integrated school library program model, by one school district, the Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District. Over the four year span of the adoption process, awareness grew within The District of the school library policy and program model recommended by Alberta Education. The need to improve the school libraries of The District had been recognized by many, from the earliest years of The District's establishment.

The Superintendent brought his knowledge of, and commitment to, the role of school libraries in teaching and learning when he came to The District as Assistant Superintendent. As Superintendent, he first turned his attention to the pressing financial problems of The District. When those problems were ameliorated, he turned his attention to instructional problems, including those related to libraries in The District.

The Board of Trustees responded to the Superintendent's concerns with interest and support. They were aware of some of the inadequacies of the libraries in The District, from their service on the Board and from their experiences as parents whose children attended schools in The District.

The possibility of access to new funding raised interest in addressing those inadequacies in a major way. The District turned to the evaluation process to provide guidance for the improvement initiative. The evaluation process assisted The District in developing a new understanding of the role of the school library in the teaching and learning activities of The District.

For the Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District, the adoption of the cooperative integrated school library program model was a lengthy problem-solving process. The Superintendent and Board of Trustees had the most significant decision-making roles in the adoption process. However, the adoption process was more than a problem-solving and decision-making process; it was a teaching and learning process through which the nature of the innovation being adopted was redefined or reconstructed by the participants in the adoption process.

Propositions

Four propositions related to the adoption process were supported by evidence from this case study. These propositions express aspects of the adoption process that appear to have been important to the successful adoption of the cooperative integrated school library program model by Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District. None of the propositions are new; however, the evidence provided from the case study may help to explain more fully their importance in the adoption process.

1. Adoption is a process over time

Fullan (1991) states that change is a process, not an event. Adoption is also a process, not an event. The formal adoption of a cooperative integrated school library program of the Focus on Learning model by Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District was the culmination of many actions and decisions, over a long period of time.

The starting point of the adoption timeline is difficult to determine; certainly it must begin before the Superintendent's formal request for a school

library program evaluation by Alberta Education. Over a period of years, principals in The District had been bringing forward, through the budget process, their concerns about their libraries. The Superintendent became aware of the state of The District's libraries when he first came to The District in 1982 as Assistant Superintendent and, when he became Superintendent, he began to share his concerns with others in The District.

The first concrete evidence of The District's intention to focus its attention on libraries was the Superintendent's letter of October 27, 1987 requesting an evaluation by Alberta Education of the school libraries in The District. The District's school library policy was approved by the Board of Trustees on May 8, 1989, seventeen months later.

The timeline for the adoption process is considerably longer, however, if the timeline is seen to begin at the point where The District became aware of the Focus on Learning model. It is clear that The District leadership at the the school and District Office level became aware of the Focus on Learning model during the 1985-1986 school year. Copies of the Focus on Learning document were received by District Office and by each school in the Fall of 1985; several principals and teachers attended Alberta Education Awareness Seminars on the new school library policy and program model; and The District accessed the Learning Resources Grant provided by Alberta Education to assist in the implementation of the policy and program model. The timeline of the adoption process then is closer to four years than seventeen months.

2. Adoption is a process of changing meaning

The development of a clear understanding of a change, whether imposed or chosen, is critical to the change process. McLaughlin & Marsh (1979), in their study of the implementation stage, refer to this as the development of

conceptual clarity. Clarification of the meaning of the innovation, its nature and critical components, can also occur during the adoption stage.

In this case study, the participants in the adoption process changed their understanding of what improving school libraries might mean. The Alberta Education evaluation of The District's libraries played a key role in changing meaning. The evaluation process clarified and shaped the definition of the innovation. It shifted generally held views of what needed to be changed.

At the beginning of the adoption process and before the evaluation, the change was understood in terms of library collections and facilities; at the end of the adoption process and after the evaluation, the change was beginning to be understood in terms of an instructional program that would be developed cooperatively by teachers and integrated with the curriculum. The nature of the problem was redefined through the evaluation process, from a problem of how collections and facilities could be upgraded to a problem of how teachers and students could use those collections and facilities. The problem became less one of how we can get the best things for our libraries and more one of how we can get teachers and students to best use our libraries for teaching and learning.

The change in problem definition resulted in changed views of the best solution. The solution to the first problem was seen in terms of an infusion of money and external expertise; the solution to the second would also require money and external expertise, but more importantly, it would require the development of expertise within The District. Teachers, principals, and District Office staff would have to be involved in learning how libraries could best be used for teaching and learning.

3. Adoption is a problem-solving process

Fullen has commented, in relation to planning for change, that "having good ideas may be less than half the battle compared with establishing a process that will allow us to use the ideas and discover additional ones along the way" (1991, p. 100). Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District appears to have established that kind of problem-solving process.

The District Office staff and the Board of Trustees saw themselves as members of a problem-solving team. They used the evaluation process to "get the facts" in order to solve a problem. A team approach was used throughout The District to make decisions related to such essential matters as budget priorities and allocations. The small size of The District and the cohesive close-knit nature of its staff and community contributed to this team concept.

The importance of each member of staff in The District in the problem-solving process was affirmed by District Office staff and members of the Board of Trustees, but this perception was not always shared by the principals. However, because on previous occasions The District had used the evaluation process to assess problems and find solutions, there appeared to be an expectation at the school level that this evaluation would also lead to changes being made. The school library program evaluation process played an important part in confirming the seriousness of the problem and setting the stage for the changes that would be involved in addressing the problem.

The problem-solving approach of The District was marked by a strong concern for "doing it right", for finding the best possible solution to the problem. This involved using expertise from outside The District. Outside assistance was utilized during the process of adoption, for the school library program evaluation and for policy development at district and school level. Outside assistance was also utilized during the early stages of implementation of the

innovation, for helping the high school staff to understand the evaluation recommendations and for recruitment of a District Librarian. This concern for doing it right, which was evident in the comments made by District Office staff, by members of the Board of Trustees, and by the principals, was often also expressed in terms of spending money wisely and well.

4. Adoption is influenced by school board leadership

School boards rarely have taken a significant role in the adoption of innovations (Fullan, 1991) but there have been cases where school boards have worked actively (and successfully) to bring about specific policy and/or program changes in their school districts.

In this study, the Board of Trustees played a significant role in the adoption process. It did much more than provide the official approval of an initiative of the Superintendent. Individual board members clearly gave the problems related to The District's libraries very serious attention. They studied the School Library Program Evaluation Report and discussed the report with interest and insight. It was because of the initiative of the Board of Trustees that the approach selected by The District to address the improvement of libraries went beyond the recommendations contained in the School Library Program Evaluation Report.

Adoption of an educational innovation is generally an initiative of district level leadership; this was cetainly the case in the adoption of the cooperative integrated school library program model by Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District.

Implications

This case study has attempted to achieve some understanding of how one school district adopted an educational innovation for the purpose of improving its school libraries. The implications that can be drawn from this study may be of interest to those involved in the adoption of educational innovations in school districts, as district leaders and decision-makers or as external evaluators working with school districts. There are also implications of interest to researchers.

Implications for Practice

1. The importance of the adoption stage in planned change

Although the interrelationships between the stages of planned change has been long recognized, the emphasis in the recent research literature has been on the implementation stage. During that implementation stage, it has been found to be essential for those involved to develop an understanding of the innovation (conceptual clarity) and of the particular context within which the innovation is being introduced (mutual adaptation). The adoption stage can also provide the opportunity for the development of understanding of the innovation and of the innovation in its context.

Successful adoption needs to be understood in terms of the generation of understanding as well as in terms of the approval of policy. Without the development of a deep understanding, during the adoption stage, of the innovation and what impact its implementation will have both on the context and the innovation itself, the task of implementation is likely to be much more difficult and less successful.

2. The role of program evaluation in program adoption

Program evaluation can play an important role in the process of adoption. It can be a powerful means for developing shared meaning and new meanings. The collection of data, the development of recommendations, and the presentation and dissemination of the School Library Program Evaluation Report report offered opportunities for discussion of the role of the school library in teaching and learning. Although many in The District were aware of the Alberta Education policy and program model, few understood that the policy and program model presented a new way of thinking about school libraries. The evaluation process encouraged the development of new understandings. Program evaluation can help to develop the understanding that is necessary for people to support the adoption of an innovation, particularly one that is external to The District such as those mandated by provincial policies. Part of the power of evaluation is its role in showing people how the new innovation is different from present practice.

Program evaluation may change the conceptualization of the planned change in unexpected ways. Few in The District expected that the evaluation process would change their view of what school libraries were all about. At the outset of the evaluation process, the adoption of a policy and program model was not the expected outcome for anyone other than the Superintendent. Most who supported the involvement in the evaluation process expected recommendations for improved collections and facilities, not recommendations for new ways to use the library for teaching and learning.

3. The effectiveness of the program evaluation process

The extent to which an evaluation is utilized or put into action, that is, its effectiveness, seems to be enhanced by a number of factors in the evaluation process.

One factor was the inclusion of a District Office staff member on the evaluation team who would have a major role in the adoption and implementation of the actions recommended in the final evaluation report. This helped to ensure that there would be someone with influence in The District committed to the recommendations who could provide pressure and support for the changes after the external members of the evaluation team had left The District.

Another important factor was the negotiation of meaning throughout the process. The process began with orienting people to the process, helping them to understand the criteria that would be used in the evaluation. The Director ensured that the Focus on Learning document was in every school and he reviewed the document with the principals. Throughout the evaluation process the evaluators showed recognition of and respect for context and for others' views of the program being evaluated. They were careful to listen to the views of the staff and students in each school. The recommendations in the final report were made in the context of The District's resources.

4. District level leaders working together

It is particularly important that the district office staff and the school board support the innovation and have the same understanding of the innovation. Joint support and shared understanding are critical to ensuring that an innovation is adopted in a way that makes possible implementation. In other words, the innovation being adopted must be clearly defined in the policy

statement approved by the school board and, as well, the resources essential to the implementation of the innovation must be allocated by the school board.

The development of understanding of the innovation is fundamental to the development of policy and the allocation of resources. Without that understanding, the clarity of the policy statement and the adequacy of resource allocation will be insufficient to take the innovation from adoption to implementation and institutionalization.

5. The role of funding in the adoption process

The adoption of the innovation was facilitated by access to new funding. New funding gave the district the opportunity to address problems they had previously viewed as impossible to address. The promise of access to new funding was sufficient but perhaps not necessary for the initiation of action related to improving libraries. The promise of new funding was critical because the improvement of libraries was seen initially in terms of spending money on collections and facilities. The promise of new funding may not have been so critical if the improvement of libraries had been seen initially in terms of learning how to use libraries for instructional purposes.

Educators often cite lack of funding as the reason for not adopting innovations such as the cooperative integrated school library program. However, the problem may not be so much the lack of funds as it is the use of funds. In the analysis of data from 73 school districts in British Columbia, Coleman and LaRocque (1990) found that high per pupil costs were associated with low student achievement. The efficiency with which school districts use their funds may have more to do with district effectiveness than does the amount of funds. The lack of funding perceived in some districts may be more a lack of skill in using that funding well, whether for current programs or for new

programs rather than an actual lack of funding. Similiar funding levels do not mean similar outcomes in terms of student achievement. School districts may be able to find more money for current programs and for new programs by improving their financial practices and rethinking their budget priorities.

6. The role of school boards in adoption

School boards rarely have had an important role in the adoption of innovations by school districts. When they have, their role has been generally to pressure district administrators to address a problem, rather than to involve themselves in shaping a solution that might address that problem. However, school board members who are knowledgeable about district programs and practices, who have a clear sense of what they want to accomplish, and who engage in activities that allow them to develop others' understanding can play a significant role in the adoption of innovations that address district needs.

Implications for Research

1. Critical factors in adoption

The change theory related to adoption consists of lists of factors that appear to impact on adoption. No evidence yet has been found that clearly suggests which factors or combinations of factors might be most critical to the adoption process. Researchers need to continue to explore cases of adoption of innovations in order to try to determine which factors are critical for ensuring adoption and for laying the foundation for successful implementation and institutionalization.

2. Critical factors in the adoption of the cooperative integrated school library program model

The cooperative integrated school library program model may be an innovation for which adoption, implementation, and institutionalization is difficult to achieve. There is some evidence to suggest this in studies by Dekker (1989) and Meyer (1990) as well as in the non-utilization of a number of school library program evaluation reports in Alberta in the 1980's. The reasons for this difficulty needs to be explored by research into attempts to introduce the cooperative integrated school library program model at the school level and at the district level.

3. Program evaluation and program meaning

The most important result of the program evaluation process may be the new understandings that the participants gain about the program being evaluated. The evaluation is complete when full resolution is achieved, that is, when consensus is reached on the recommendations, the actions to be taken. Research is needed to explore the relationship between the development of shared meanings and the effectiveness of the program evaluation process (evaluation utilization).

4. The role of school boards in improving education

Effective school boards can have a positive impact on education. However, effective school boards do not appear to differ in any significant way from less effective ones, in terms of either trustee characteristics or type of community served (LaRocque & Coleman, 1989). Furthermore, few trustees receive any training or preparation for their roles (Danzberger, Carol, Cunningham, Kirst, McCloud, & Usdan, 1987). There needs to be research

done on how school boards can develop the capacity to make a positive difference in the educational programs offered in their districts.

Questions for Reflection

This case study is the story of how Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District began the process of improving its school libraries. Inevitably, some readers of this thesis must ask themselves, as I have, if this is the only story that could be told about the process. There must also be questions related as well to the importance of the elements of the process and how the story might have been different if one or more of the elements had been different in some way. I can not anticipate all the speculations that this case study may evoke for its readers, but I wish to consider a few of the questions that might arise for them.

1. The possibility of other interpretations

Whose story is being told in this case study? This case study has been based on multiple sources of information including the stories of the participants in that process. It must be said that this case study is my interpretation of the events and their meanings, verified by the participants, but my interpretation nevertheless.

2. The effect of time on interpretation

How has the nature of the story changed over time? The informants who participated in this retrospective research study were recalling events of the past, albeit the recent past, in most instances. It is impossible to determine to what extent informants may have omitted or forgotten certain thoughts, feelings or actions. Information related to the reasons for those

thoughts, feelings, or actions is also susceptible to changes over time. It is usual for people to tell stories in ways that reflect well on themselves. It is also natural for people, as meaning-makers, to find patterns in their experiences, to see cause and effect where perhaps on closer examination little evidence for that relationship exists. It is possible that the story might have been presented differently if the informants had been interviewed more closely in time to the events being recalled.

3. The effect of success on interpretations

The efforts to improve the school libraries in The District constituted a success story for the majority of the informants. The perception of success may have resulted in the informants' forgetting of negative or unpleasant thoughts, feelings, or actions. For example, most informants more readily identified factors that facilitated the changes than factors that constrained or made the changes difficult. However, it is not unusual for people to forget doubts, or anger, or resistance, when all turns well in the end. There was, in the interview data, some evidence of initial difficulties related to the improvement of school libraries in The District. Most of the difficulties centred around the School Library Evaluation Report. A few informants noted that some library support staff were dismayed to find no support for the reading promotion programs that they had developed; others reported that some teachers and principals disagreed with the evaluators' assessment of particular school library programs. It is possible there was much more opposition to the change process; informants may have minimized that opposition later because of the apparent success of the improvement efforts.

4. The transferability of findings

Can readers discover, within this case study of one district's experiences, understandings that can be applied to situations in other districts? It must be recognized that the factors identified as critical in the adoption of a cooperative integrated school library program model by Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School may not be the critical factors for another school district. For example, three critical factors for The District were the role of the Superintendent in initiating change, the role of the external evaluators in teaching about the change, and the role of the Director in learning about the change. Other districts might not be able to replicate this these factors in their situations. However, they might be able to find other ways to accomplish the initiating, teaching and learning activities that are critical to successful change.

The Superintendent was a strong initiator of the change in The District. What if the superintendent is not the one to initiate the change? Could someone else in a district take the initiating role? This might be possible, if that someone were an individual or group within the district working at the leadership level. District-wide changes necessitate involvement by district level leaders, either district office staff or school board members. Individuals or groups outside the school district, such as program evaluators or parent groups, may support change but it is unlikely that they can initiate a district-wide change without the advocacy or initiation of district leaders.

The school library program evaluation contributed a great deal to the understanding of the innovation within The District. The external evaluators played a teaching role, helping people at the school and district level to develop a clear understanding of the innovation. This teaching role might be carried out by someone within a district who has the necessary expertise and time. Lacking those resources of expertise and time, a district would need to go

beyond its borders to contract for services. Because of its proximity to the workplaces of the external evaluators, The District was able to call on the evaluators for further assistance, both formal presentations related to the evaluation report and informal consultations related to the report recommendations. In districts more remote from the sources of consulting services, provisions need to be made for follow-up and ongoing assistance in addition to the initial evaluation services.

The Director, Curriculum and Instruction, went beyond his original coordination role in the school library program evaluation process. The Director thus began the process of developing expertise within The District related to the cooperative integrated school library program. Without the involvement of a district level person who has expertise related to the innovation, adoption is difficult and implementation is unlikely to be successful. In districts where expertise related to the innovation is lacking, some effort will need to be extended to identify individuals with interests or backgrounds that make them open to the innovation and to arrange for appropriate learning experiences so that they can provide expertise within the district. The development of understanding within the district is critical to successful change.

A Bright Beginning

The adoption of an innovation is only the first step in the process of educational change. Many bright beginnings have faded away to nothing. However, the adoption of an cooperative integrated school library program in Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District seemed to have, in good measure, the characteristics that Miles (1987) found in adoptions that were

successfully implemented: (a) strong advocacy; (b) need; (c) active initiation; and (d) a clear model for proceeding.

The improvement of The District's libraries was supported strongly by the Superintendent and the Director. Several school board members and several principals were also committed to change from the beginning of the adoption process. Through the process, more school board members and more principals became supportive of the change.

The need for the change was clearly evident within The District at all levels, from students to school board members. From the earliest days of The District, libraries had been underfunded. The high school library was the one most clearly inadequate to meet the needs of teachers and students.

There was active initiation of the change by the Superintendent and by several school board members. The program evaluation was viewed as a way to guide the action of the District and the recommendations of the report were taken very seriously by District Office staff and the school board.

The Alberta Education policy and program model provided a clear model for proceeding. The recommendations of the school library program evaluation team were based on that policy and program model. In addition, the implementation of the policy and model in neighboring school districts also provided some patterns for guidance.

These characteristics of the adoption of the cooperative integrated school library program by Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District indicate a promising beginning for the implementation phase of this educational change.

Chapter 10

EPILOGUE

The adoption of a District School Library Policy and the decision to hire a teacher-librarian to fill the position of District Librarian signalled The District's commitment to an instructional program in its libraries. Since those decisions at the end of the 1988-1989 school year, The District has made positive progress in improving school library programs in all schools. At the high school, teachers have begun to implement a cooperative integrated school library program by working with the teacher-librarian in the development of library-based units of study. In the other schools, elementary and elementary-junior high, the teacher-librarian in his position of District Librarian has been modelling for teachers the role that they will need to take in developing library-based units of study, on their own or in cooperation with other teachers and the principal.

In the second half of the 1988-1989 school year, when the adoption of the District School Library Policy and the decision to hire a teacher-librarian was under consideration at the Board and District Office level, District Office staff was also initiating activities at the school level. Immediately after the completion of the School Library Program Evaluation Report, The District began to act on the recommendations of the report and to lay the groundwork for the implementation of the cooperative integrated school library program model. A library committee was established in each school and $125,000 was allocated for the first phase in upgrading library collections. Each school was required to develop a library policy based on the Alberta school library policy and and to develop an action plan for improving its library:

> The Director was working on The District policy and each of the schools had to have a library policy. . . . It was discussed at a principal's meeting. . . . We knew that money was going to be made available. . . . We got out Focus and we started asking some questions. I was able to talk to the ladies who were on the evaluation team and they were very helpful. . . . We were, of course, to involve our staff in developing the policy and I did. (Principal, Interview)

The timeline was short, but all schools completed their policies and action plans within the allotted time frame. Some principals felt the timeline for selecting the materials and spending their allocations was unrealistically short and all were very concerned that the money be spent wisely:

> The ordering came through, the approval to go and start shaking down our schools for what we needed in various subject areas, came in June. They gave us about two weeks to do our ordering and we felt the pressure, you know. It was all done manually. And then the back orders came in and there was a problem because the money had to be spent by August 31. Terrible, but the first year we learned the hard way. (Principal, Interview)

> We had to spend this money to buy books, and we were in this position, you know, what do you do with it? You don't want to be foolish with it because this money's hard to come by. . . . I went and visited some schools. [One librarian] gave us a listing of basic reference books. She said to me, 'These are very basic reference books, you can't go wrong if you get them.' So that's what we did. We ordered those because there was a deadline when that money had to be spent. (Principal, Interview)

Despite a short timeline and limited library-related expertise, the schools did carry out their action plans in relation to the improvement of collections.

Selecting a teacher-librarian for the District Librarian position was recognized as an important and crucial matter. The person selected would need to be able to work at all grade levels, have thorough knowledge of all aspects of school librarianship, and have the skills to provide consultative services to administrators, teachers, and support staff. In addition, it was preferable that the person selected be of the Catholic faith. It was quickly

realized by the Board of Trustees and the Superintendent that a person with the requisite qualifications could not easily be found and that such a senior person would not be likely to want to leave his or her school system permanently, at least not initially. A secondment seemed to be the best route to pursue.

The Director enlisted the assistance of the evaluation team members for suggestions. One name came up consistently, that of a teacher-librarian employed by the County of Strathcona Board of Education in a junior high school. His qualifications appeared to make him eminently suitable for the District Librarian position. He had a Master of Library Science from the University of Alberta; he had been Acting Director, Learning Resources, for the County Board of Education for a four-month period; he was known to be a dynamic and energetic person; he had given a number of professional development workshops. In addition, although working in the public school system, he was a Catholic and his children were enrolled in a nearby Catholic school district.

The Superintendent contacted the superintendent of the County Board of Education to discuss the possible secondment of the teacher-librarian. The County superintendent readily gave his approval and the teacher-librarian was approached to consider the position. The Director took the teacher-librarian on a tour through The District's eight schools and discussed with him the parameters of the job. The teacher-librarian agreed to accept a two-year secondment, beginning September 1989. Although the Director had requested that the secondment begin in May, this could not be arranged. The District Librarian position was divided into two areas of responsibility: 60% of the librarian's time would be spent as the teacher-librarian of the high school and

and 40% would be spent providing consulting services to the eight schools and to District Office.

The teacher-librarian began work in August. His first priority was cleaning up and rearranging the high school library in order to make it a workable teaching facility and an inviting environment. He also worked with the Director to begin to develop a plan of action for the year ahead.

The teacher-librarian was given a great deal of autonomy in relation to how the mandate of the secondment was carried out:

> Basically when I was hired it was 'Do what you want, do what you think needs to be done.' The rules were that I had this evaluation from Alberta Education and this is where things needed improving. The other thing that was emphasized to me was that Catholic education is important in this system. The third thing was that there would be budget and there would be support from the Superintendent, the principals, and the Curriculum Director. . . . I've been given a lot of trust and leeway. . . . For example, when I talked to the Superintendent about a security system, he said, 'I trust you. . . . If you think we need it, we'll get it.' (District Librarian, Interview).

This support for improving The District's libraries was evident from the District Librarian's first official day in the school district:

> On the first day of school a major inservice was held for all of the teachers. The Superintendent stood up and spoke and so did one of the school board members and both of them mentioned as a top priority the idea of cleaning up the libraries and developing the library program. . . . When that happened I realized that this is an important priority for this district at this time. (District Librarian, Interview)

The District provides professional development opportunities for all instructional staff through the annual one-day Institute for The District and through weekly one-hour release time periods for school level professional development activities. The Director and the District Librarian utilized these and other opportunities, such as the Administration Meeting, the regular meetings of the principals and District Office staff, to schedule a series of

inservices related to changes in The District's libraries. By the end of the first half of the school year, inservices had been held for The District as a whole, for each school staff, for teachers by division, for principals, and for library support staff. In addition, a district-level library committee had been established, with representatives from each school, to work with the District Librarian and the Director on a scope and sequence of information skills for the district. Additional and more in-depth inservice experiences were provided for the district-level library committee. The District Librarian made regular visits to all the schools, informally providing advice and assistance tailored to the expressed needs of each school and on occasion providing demonstration lessons on library use.

In January the District Librarian presented a progress report to the Board:

> I did a presentation just after Christmas at a board meeting and outlined things that I had been doing, initiatives such as the Focus on Learning inservices, changing facilities, weeding collections, and basically how this impacted on teachers and students. The Board was very supportive and some of the questions were excellent questions. You know, 'What should we do as far as automation?' One question was what benefits would having teacher-librarians in The District serve. That was an excellent question and I tried to give a good answer for that. They were certainly very interested. (District Librarian, Interview)

In May, members of the evaluation team were invited back to The District to do a followup on the School Library Program Evaluation Report. The results of that visit were reported to the Superintendent and the Board of Trustees. The first year of the teacher-librarian's secondment closed with a District inservice on a new document from Alberta Education, Focus on Research (1990). The District was pleased to be the first district in the province to be involved in the inservice program for the document.

In the second year, the District Librarian's focus shifted slightly to the work at the high school. He worked with teachers to develop cooperatively planned integrated units and he began to plan for the automation of the high school library's catalogue and circulation system.

The professional development activities related to the library program continued, focussing on practical strategies for teachers. This was deemed to be imperative for all teachers at the elementary and junior high levels since they would continue to have the major reponsibility for integrating the library program into their classroom program. For the forseeable future, only the high school teachers would have the services of an on-site teacher-librarian (and then only on a parttime basis). Each school participated in a Focus on Research inservice and the District Librarian provided many model lessons.

The final major initiative of the District Librarian during the last few months of his secondment was the development of a series of library-based teaching units for use in The District, one for each grade from one to nine. Teams of teachers were provided release time to work with the District Librarian to develop these units.

At the end of the second year of his secondment, the District Librarian faced a difficult decision, whether to return to the County of Strathcona Board of Education or to stay on in Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District as a permanent staff member. When he made the decision to return to the County of Strathcona Board of Education, the position of District Librarian was advertised as a permanent position.

In September 1991, a new chapter began in the story of The District's efforts to improve its libraries. A qualified teacher-librarian was hired for the District Librarian position. She is working both as the high school teacher-

librarian and as the district consultant for libraries. I and many others will be watching with great interest as this new chapter unfolds.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alberta Education. (1983). Position paper on school libraries in Alberta. Edmonton, AB: Author.

Alberta Education. (1984). Policy, guidelines, procedures and standards for school libraries in Alberta. Edmonton, AB: Author.

Alberta Education. (1985). Focus on learning: An integrated program model for Alberta school libraries. Edmonton, AB: Author.

Alberta Education. (1986). Focussed on learning: An inservice manual for school library program development. Edmonton, AB: Author.

Alberta Education. (1990). Focus on research: A guide to developing students' research skills. Edmonton, AB: Author.

Alkin, M. C. (1982). Parameters of evaluation utilization/use. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 8(2), 153-156.

Alkin, M. C., Daillak, R., & White, P. (1979). Using evaluations: Does evaluation make a difference? Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Berg, B. L. (1989). Qualitative research methods for the social sciences. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Berman, P. (1978). The study of macro- and micro-implementation. Public Policy, 26(2), 157-184.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1976). Implementation of educational innovation. The Educational Forum, 40(3), 345-370.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1977). Federal programs supporting educational change: Vol. VII. Factors affecting implementation continuation. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. (ERIC ED 159 289)

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change: Vol. VIII. Implementing and sustaining innovations. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. (ERIC ED 159 289)

Brown, J. (1988). Changing teaching practice to meet current expectations: Implications for teacher-librarians. Emergency Librarian, 16(2), 9-14.

Carlson, R. O. (1972). School superintendents: Careers and performance. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Carson, T. R. (1986). Closing the gap between research and practice: Conversation as a mode of doing research. Phenomenology and Pedagogy, 4(2), 73-85.

Coleman, P., & LaRocque, L. (1983). Linking educational research and educational policy via policy-relevant research. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 29(3), 242-255.

Coleman, P., & LaRocque, L. (1990). Struggling to be 'good enough': Administrative practices and school district ethos. London: Falmer.

Crandall, D. P. (1984). School improvement: What the research says. Paper presented at the Regional Workshop of the Appalachia Educational Laboratory. (ERIC ED 251 969)

Cumming, A. (1988). Educating through educational evaluation: An idealistic response to Ronald Mackay's "Program evaluation and quality control." TESL Canada Journal, 5(2), 43-50.

Daft, R., & Becker, S. (1978). The innovative organization: Innovative adoption in school organizations. New York: Elsevier North-Holland.

Danzberger, P., Carol, L., Cunningham, L., Kirst, M., McCloud, B., & Usdan, M. (1987). School boards: The forgotten players on the education team. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(1), 53-59.

Dawson, J. A. & D'Amico, J. J. (1985). Involving program staff in evaluation studies: A strategy for increasing information use and enriching the data base. Evaluation Review, 9(2), 173-188.

Dekker, B. (1989). Principals and teacher-librarians--their roles and attitudes towards school libraries. School Libraries in Canada, 9(2), 32-37.

Dobbert, M. L. (1982). Ethnographic research: Theory and application for modern schools and societies. New York: Praeger.

Firestone, W. A., & Herriott, R. E. (1981). Images of organization and the promotion of educational change. Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization, 2, 221-260.

Fitzpatrick, J. L. (1988). Roles of the evaluator in innovative programs: A formative evaluation. Evaluation Review, 12(4), 449-461.

Fraietta, J., & McBride, N. L. (1989). Small districts' curriculum resource bank: A case study in shared services. Unpublished master's project, Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Fullan, M. (1982a). The meaning of educational change. Toronto, ON: OISE Press.

Fullan, M. (1982b). Implementing educational change: Progress at last. Paper presented at the National Invitational Conference, Research on Teaching: Implications for Practice, Warrenton, VA. (ERIC ED 221 540)

Fullan, M. G. (1991). The new meaning of educational change (2nd ed). Toronto, ON: OISE Press/New York: Teachers College Press.

Glaser, B. G. (1978). Theoretical sensitivity. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Fourth generation evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). Ethnography: Principles in practice. London: Tavistock.

Hord, S. M. (1988). Riding the coat-tails of mandates: Gaining entry and developing trust in rural effective schools projects. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

House, E. R. (1974). The politics of educational innovation. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1984). Innovation up close: How school improvement works. New York: Plenum.

Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1986). Rethinking the quest for school improvement: Some findings from the DESSI study. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Rethinking school improvement: Research, craft, and concept. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kunjbehari, L. L. (1981). Politics and expertise in policy making: A model and case study. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

LaRocque, L., & Coleman, P. (1989). The politics of excellence: Trustee leadership and school district ethos. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Leavitt, H. J. (1972). Managerial psychology: An introduction to individuals, pairs, and groups in organizations (3d ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Leviton, L. C., & Hughes, E. (1981). Research on the utilization of evaluations: A review and synthesis. Evaluation Review, 5(4), 525-548.

Lewin, K. (1951). Field theory in social science. New York: Harper & Row.

Lincoln, Y. (1990). The making of a constructivist: A remembrance of transformations past. In E. G. Guba (Ed.), The paradigm dialog. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Louis, K. S. (1986). Reforming secondary schools: A critique and an agenda for administrators. Educational Leadership, 44(1), 33-36.

Louis, K. S. (1989). The role of the school district in school improvement. In M. Holmes, K. Leithwood, & D. Musella, Educational policy for effective schools. Toronto, ON: OISE Press.

Mackay, R. (1988). Position paper: Program evaluation and quality control. TESL Canada Journal, 5,(2), 33-42.

Malone, D. J. (1980). Establishing a regional film library. Unpublished master's project, Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

McLaughlin, M. (1976). Implementation as mutual adaptation: Changes in classroom organization. In W. Williams & R. Elmore (Eds.), Social program implementation. New York: Academic Press.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Marsh, D. D. (1979). Staff development and school change. In A. Lieberman & L. Miller (Eds.), Staff development: New demands, new realities, new perspectives. New York: Teachers College Press.

Meara, H. (1979). Mutual adaptation: Using outside information in educational practice. Paper from the Documentation and Technical Assistance in Urban Schools Project, Chicago, IL. (ERIC ED 229 469)

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Meyer, J. (1990). An investigation into the implementation of cooperatively planned resource-based learning from the perspective of teachers. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, SK.

Miles, M. B. (1987). Practical guidelines for school administrators: How to get there. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC ED 288 939)

Mitchell, D. E. (1980). Social science impact on legislative decision making: Process and substantive. Educational Researcher, 9(10), 9-19.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1986). The superintendent as instructional leader: Findings from effective school districts. Journal of Educational Administration, 24(2), 213-236.

Nelson, M., & Sieber, S. D. (1976). Innovation in urban secondary schools. School Review, 84, 213-231.

Newton, E. E. (1987). Change in small rural schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC. (ERIC ED 282 679)

Oberg, D. (1990). The school library program and the culture of the school. Emergency Librarian, 18(1), 9-16.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (1982). Partners in action: The library resource centre in the school curriculum. Toronto, ON: Author.

Patterson, J. L., & Czaijkowski, T. J. (1979). Implementation: Neglected phase in curriculum change. Educational Leadership, 37(3), 204-206.

Pritchard, B. (1983). Evaluation: A proposal for purpose and use. (ERIC ED 241 544)

Romberg, T. A., & Price, G. G. (1981). Assimilation of innovations into the culture of the school: Impediments to radical change. Paper presented at the NIE Conference on Issues Related to the Implementation of Computer Technology in Schools, Washington, DC. (ERIC ED 202 156)

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989). Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools. New York: Longman.

Shields, R. (1989). Concerns-based adoption model. In Implementing change: A cooperative approach. Vancouver, BC: British Columbia Teacher-Librarians' Association.

Turnbull, B. J. (1985). Using governance and support systems to advance school improvement. Elementary School Journal, 85(3), 337-352.

Weber, S. J. (1986). The nature of interviewing. Phenomenology and Pedagogy, 4(2), 65-72.

Weiss, C. H. (1977). Research for policy's sake: The enlightenment function of social research. Policy Analysis, 3, 531-545.

Yin, R. K. (1989). Case study research: Design and methods (rev. ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

APPENDIX A

Interview Schedule

IMPLEMENTATION OF A SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAM: A CASE STUDY

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. Would you outline briefly your training and your experience in the field of education?

2. What experiences have been critical in developing your understanding of libraries in education?

3. When and how did you become aware that libraries in the district needed some change?

4. What made you decide that the library program in the district could be changed?

5. Would you tell me how the district went about developing the policy and plan for making the change?

6. Could you tell me how the changes were introduced to the trustees? to the high school teachers? to the students? to the parents?

7. Do you know of any activities that have been carried out or will be carried out to continue to keep these people informed and/or involved?

8. What resources, if any, were made available for facilitating the changes?

9. What changes, if any, have you observed in how the students and teachers use the library at the high school?

10. What reactions to the changes, if any, have there been on the part of trustees? the high school teachers? the students? the parents?

11. What has facilitated the change efforts? What has made them more difficult to carry out?

12. What do you want to see as the outcome of the change process that the district has undertaken?

13. Are there any other comments or observations that you would like to make about the changes or the process of change in which the district is now involved?

May 15, 1990

APPENDIX B

Informed Consent Form

PROJECT TITLE: Implementation of a School Library Program: A Case Study

INVESTIGATOR: Dianne Oberg, B.Ed., M.L.S., Ph.D. (candidate)
Faculty of Library and Information Studies
University of Alberta

ADVISORS: Dr. D. A. MacKay, Professor
Department of Educational Administration
University of Alberta

Dr. S. Bertram, Professor
Faculty of Library and Information Studies
University of Alberta

This is to certify that I, _____, hereby agree to participate in this research project, the purpose of which is to develop an understanding of the implementation of a school library program at the district and school level.

I consent to be interviewed by the investigator and to have the interview taped. I understand that the interview tapes will be heard only by the investigator and the person transcribing the interview tapes. The information I provide will be kept confidential through the use of pseudonyms.

I understand that I am free to decline to answer specific questions during the interview, or to discontinue my participation at any time.

I understand that I have the right to review the interview transcripts, the analysis of the interview data, and any articles the investigator wishes to publish based on the interviews.

_____
(Signature of Participant)

_____
(Date)

_____
(Signature of Investigator)

APPENDIX C

Letter of Permission

SHERWOOD PARK CATHOLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 105

2017 Brentwood Blvd.
Sherwood Park, Alberta
T8A 0X2

Telephone (403) 467-8896
Fax (403) 467-5469

June 4, 1991

Ms. Diane Oberg
Department of Elementary Education
551 Education South
University of Alberta
T6E 4R6

Dear Ms. Oberg:

This letter will confirm our agreement that you may use the name of the Sherwood Park Separate School District No. 105 in your Doctoral Thesis relevant to the research conducted in our District.

Yours truly,

DC/ivp

Darrell Clarkson
Superintendent

APPENDIX D

Letter to Informants

February 27, 1992

Dear:

I have now completed the first draft of my thesis, which is based on research work on school libraries in the Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District over the past two years. The thesis is tentatively titled **Adoption of a School Library Program by Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District: A Promising Beginning**.

Thank you for so generously contributing to the study. I am attaching the pages from the draft thesis in which I think you will be particularly interested. As you can see, I have not directly named you in the text but you are specifically identified by name and current position in the Case Data Base appendix. I hope I have captured accurately, your meanings and intentions, in my selection of data from your comments. I would appreciate your thoughts and reactions. Your insights will help to ensure that I have interpreted the data fairly.

If you wish to review the text in full, it is available from me or from one of the following:

Darrel Clarkson, Superintendent
Jim Retallack, Director, Curriculum and Instruction
Ruth Hayden, Chair, Board of Trustees

Please call me at 492-3669 (days) or 433-0374 (evenings) or write me a note if you have any questions or suggestions, or if you can help me to clarify the text in any way.

The final thesis will be made available to Sherwood Park Catholic School Separate District when my final Ph.D. examination has been completed, probably sometime in May 1992.

Yours truly,

Dianne Oberg
Provisional Ph.D. Candidate
University of Alberta

DO/nms

APPENDIX E

Case Data Base

SCHOOL BOARD DOCUMENTS
Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District No. 105

Board Highlights

Board Highlights is a one-page newsletter produced by District Office staff and distributed with the parish bulletin twice monthly. The newsletter reports the business of the meetings of the Board of Trustees and provides information about agenda items for upcoming meetings. The Board of Trustees meets on the second and fourth Monday of the month.

The following issues of Board Highlights provided information relevant to this study:

88/12/12 Library Evaluation Report
89/01/09 Notice of Motion: To establish a District LibraryPolicy
89/05/08 Final Approval of District Library Policy
90/01/08 Report from District Librarian

Annual Reports

Each Annual Report of the Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District No. 105, produced by the Board of Trustees and District Office staff, provides information for the public on the programs, operations, and finances of The District. The goals of the Board of Trustees for The District and an overview of the year's accomplishments are included in all Annual Reports. Beginning with the 1986-87 school year, The District has used a newsprint flyer format, with more visual content and more recognition of individual and school achievements.

The following Annual Reports were reviewed for information relevant to this study:

Annual Report 1984-85
Annual Report 1985
Annual Report 1986
Annual Report 1986-87
Annual Report 1987-88
Annual Report 1988-89
Annual Report 1989-90

Memoranda and Planning Documents

The following documents cover the period of time from when the School Library Program Evaluation was planned and carried out to when the evaluation report recommendations were implemented:

Objectives 1987-88 - Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum
Things Needing Attention - Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum
Objectives 1987-88 - Acting Director, Curriculum & Instruction
Objectives 1988-89 - Director, Curriculum & Instruction
Objectives 1989-90 - Director, Curriculum & Instruction
Draft Proposal #1, January 1989 - School Library Policy and Action Plan - Superintendent
School Library Policy - Memo from Superintendent to Principals and School Library Clerk/Technicians, December 7, 1989

Other Documents

The following documents provided general information about the development of The District, its schools, and its programs:

25th Anniversary History Book 1962-1987
1990-91 Parents Schools Partnership brochure
Back to School Bulletin Parent Information Newsletter, September 1990

SCHOOL AND PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORTS

A number of school and program evaluations were conducted within The District with the assistance of Alberta Education, during the 1980s. The following reports were consulted for information about school libraries in The District:

87/06 Ukrainian Bilingual Program Evaluation
Father Kenneth Kearns School
Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District

88/11 School Library Program Evaluation
Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District

89/03 School Evaluation
Archbishop Jordan High School
Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District

DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAM EVALUATION

87/10/27 Letter from D. Clarkson to C. McLean
-request for evaluation of libraries in Sherwood

88/01/14 Letter from E. Easton to D. Clarkson
-commitment to begin school library program evaluation in September 1988

88/02/02 Letter from J. Retallack to E. Easton
-request for school library program guidelines and for program evaluation to begin as soon as possible after October 1, 1988

88/09/08 Letter from J. Retallack to E. Easton
-request to set up planning meeting for school library program evaluation

88/09/08 Notes from E. Easton of meeting with J. Retallack and D. Clarkson
-team members, terms of reference

88/10/07 Evaluation Schedule
-schedule for on-site work in The District of the school library program evaluation team

90/06/11 Library Follow-up Report
-review of The District's progress in implementing the recommendations of the 1988 School Library Program Evaluation Report - all recommendations were found to have been implemented during the eighteen months following the presentation of the Evaluation Report to The District

INTERVIEWS WITH INFORMANTS AND OBSERVATIONS IN THE DISTRICT

The interviews and observations carried out in the course of the study are listed below in chronological order. Information provided for each interview or observation includes the locale, the names and current positions of informants or participants, their involvement in the efforts to improve The District's libraries, and the topics addressed during the interview or visit to The District.

90/05/17 Follow-up to November 1988 School Library Program Evaluation Report
-visits to all school libraries in The District

-observation of libraries, discussions with principals and library staff
-members of the visiting group: J. Retallack (Director, Curriculum and Instruction), B. Draginda (District Librarian), G. Duncan (Evaluator), E. Easton (Evaluator), D. Oberg (Researcher)

90/05/18 Interview with B. Draginda, District Librarian (Teacher-librarian seconded from the County of Strathcona Board of Education from September 1989 to June 1991)
-interview at Archbishop Jordan High School in the library
-review of followup visits to libraries in The District with the evaluation team
-discussion of first year of school library program implementation efforts

90/05/22 Interview with D. Clarkson, Superintendent (Superintendent of The District since 1984)
-interview in his office
-addressed topics outlined in Interview Schedule
-explained access to funding through the Castle Catholic School District and the Association for the Advancement of Catholic Education
-described his concept of the role of the library in teaching
-expressed concerns about new technologies

90/05/22 Interview with J. Retallack, Director, Curriculum & Instruction (Appointed Director in 1987)
-interview at his office
-addressed topics outlined in Interview Schedule
-discussed changing understanding of libraries
-reviewed response of The District to the School Library Program Evaluation Report

90/05/25 Interview with A. Royer, Principal of Archbishop Jordan High School (Principal of school since 1980)
-interview in his office
-addressed topics outlined in Interview Schedule
-discussed financial base of The District and its impact on libraries; involvement of principals and teachers in changes in library, both policy and programs; role of the Board of Trustees and Superintendent in the changes

90/05/25 Second Interview with B. Draginda
-interview at Archbishop Jordan High School in the library
-addressed topics outlined in Interview Schedule
-obtained copies of his monthly action plans and reports which were prepared for the principal of the high school and the Director

90/06/01 Interview with R. Hayden, Trustee (Trustee since 1986; Associate Professor at the University of Alberta)

-interview in the researcher's office at the University of Alberta
-addressed topics outlined in Interview Schedule
-commented on impact of visit of Facilities Committee to high school library; decision-making in The District; focus of improvement; pressures for change; changing understanding of libraries; impact of new technologies

90/11/25 Third Interview with B. Draginda
-interview at Archbishop Jordan High School in the library
-discussed his plans for the second year of implementation of the school library program model
-discussed his involvement and communication with others in The District

90/12/05 Second Interview with R. Hayden
-interview in her office at the University of Alberta
-suggested interview with T. Paszek who had been Chair of Facilities Committee
-commented on shift in the District's library program from an emphasis on reading promotion to an emphasis on research

90/12/05 Interview with G. Duncan, Evaluator (Consultant, Library Media for Edmonton Catholic Schools since 1982)
-interview at her office
-addressed topics outlined in Interview Schedule
-commented on evaluation process; changing understanding of role of and responsibility for libraries; followup involvement in The District

90/12/06 Second Interview with D. Clarkson
-interview in his office
-commented on change timelines; restructuring of District Office; understanding of libraries in The District; factors affecting change; future implementation challenges
-suggested interview with L. Miller related to District response to Focus on Learning

90/12/06 Second Interview with J. Retallack
-interview at his office
-suggested interview with L. Miller for more information on The District's response to Focus on Learning and the Learning Resources Grant
-discussed role of evaluation in changing understanding of libraries

90/12/06 Second Interview with A. Royer
-interview in his office
-reviewed role of key decision makers
-commented on impact of Facilities Committee visit to the high school library

-indicated role of Evaluators following evaluation

90/12/11 Interview with E. Easton, Evaluator (Consultant for Libraries and Media for Edmonton Regional Office of Alberta Education since 1988)
-interview in her office
-addressed topics outlined in Interview Schedule
-commented on evaluation process; changing under-standing of role of and reponsibility for libraries in The District; role of key decision-makers; followup involvment with The District; early implementation efforts

91/02/25 Interview with L. Miller, Assistant Superintendent Curriculum 1982-1987 (Retired; now Tax Researcher for The District)
-interview at District Office
-addressed topics outlined in Interview Schedule
-commented on role of teachers and support staff in library use; response of District to Focus on Learning; role of District Office staff

91/03/11 Interview with T. Paszek, Trustee (Trustee since 1983; Consultant, Staff Development for Edmonton Catholic Schools)
-interview in the researcher's office at the University of Alberta
-addressed topics outlined in Interview Schedule
-commented on access to and use of funding; visit of Facilities Committee to high school library; role of educator-trustees; key roles in change; potential of technology

91/03/13 Interview with N. McBride, Principal, Father Kenneth Kearns School
-interview in his office
-addressed topics outlined in Interview Schedule
-commented on decision-making in The District; development of school library program; role of students and parents in change

91/03/18 Interview with G. Nestransky, Principal, & D. Malone, Vice-Principal, St. Theresa School
-interview in the principal's office
-addressed topics outlined in Interview Schedule
-reviewed the development of libraries in The District; decision-making in The District; concerns about potential of new technologies

91/05/01 Interview with M. Lynch, Trustee (Trustee since 1973; Consultant, Science for Edmonton Catholic Schools)
-interview at his office
-addressed topics outlined in Interview Schedule
-reviewed the innovation history of The District
-commented on roles of Superintendent and Board of Trustees; decision-making in The District; role of evaluation; early implementation efforts

91/05/25 Interview with K. Lesniak, Trustee (Trustee since 1986; Director of Continuing Education for Edmonton Catholic Schools)
-interview in his office
-addressed topics outlined in Interview Schedule
-commented on evaluations of high school and of District libraries; roles of Board of Trustees, Superintendent, Director; decisions on spending Castle money; changes in understanding of libraries; factors affecting change

91/06/24 Third Interview with J. Retallack
-interview in his office
-discussed pilot projects, innovative programs within The District
-provided researcher with Annual Reports, planning documents, and other District records

91/06/26 Fourth Interview with B. Draginda
-reviewed the progress made over two years of school library program implementation

91/07/04 Interview with J. Boisvert, Trustee (Trustee since 1983; Project Manager, Alberta Government Telephones)
-interview at his home in Sherwood Park
-addressed topics outlined in Interview Schedule
-discussed role of technology in education and in relation to libraries
-commented on team approach in District; role of educator-trustees; innovation history of the District

OTHER SOURCES FROM OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT

Several theses, completed at the University of Alberta, related to aspects of The District's development, operations, and program provided information relevant to this study. They are cited in the text of this thesis and are listed in the bibliography. In addition, the following documents from sources outside The District were consulted:

Curriculum implementation. (1990). Ovation, 2(1). [Alberta Education newsletter]
-article describes the Curriculum Resource Bank as one of several innovative approaches to curriculum implementation

Edmonton Regional Office of Alberta Education. (1987). County of Strathcona Evaluation of School Library Learning Resource Centre Programs. Edmonton, AB: Author.
-assessment of school library programs and district-level learning resource services

APPENDIX F

Case Chronology

The following is a chronological summary of events prior to and following the final approval of the District Library Policy by the Board of Trustees of the Sherwood Park Catholic Separate School District. Brief annotations have been provided where appropriate.

October 1984	Alberta School Library Policy approved
July 1985	Appointment of Superintendent to position -Superintendent had been employed by The District as Assistant Superintendent, Personnel (Staff and Student) since August 1982
September 1985	Focus on Learning distributed to all schools and school districts in Alberta
February 14, 1986	The Heart of the School Workshop
October 1987	Trustee Elections
October 27, 1987	First request from The District for a school library program evaluation by Edmonton Regional Office of Alberta Education
November 1987	Appointment to Position of the Director, Curriculum & Instruction -Director had been employed by The District as teacher, then vice-principal and community school coordinator
January 1988	Facilities Committee visit to all District schools
September 8, 1988	Planning Meeting for School Library Program Evaluation -Planning done by Superintendent; Director, Curriculum and Instruction; and Consultant from the Edmonton Regional Office of Alberta Education
October 7-14, 1988	School library program evaluation team on-site
December 12, 1988	Presentation of evaluation report to Board of Trustees by Associate Director and Consultant from the Edmonton Regional Office of Alberta Education
January 1989	School Library Program Evaluation Report given to schools
January 1989	Draft Library Policy and Action Plan developed

January 8, 1989	Meeting of the Board of Trustees -Superintendent presents Action Plan as information
May 8, 1989	Final approval of District School Library Policy by Board of Trustees
September 1989	Teacher-librarian from County of Strathcona Board of Education begins 2 year secondment as District Librarian
May 17, 1990	Review of District's Library Program -Follow-up visit by the evaluation team and the researcher
June 11, 1990	Library Follow-up Report (Year 1) presented to Board of Trustees
September 1991	District Librarian position permanently established in The District and new District Librarian appointed